PRO
VERITATE
ET
REGNO
DEI
CHARLES HOLBROOK LIBRARY
Pacific School of Religion

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/theological-magazine-esna_1932-01-01_60

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

Theological Magazine

of the

Evangelical Synod of North America.

Published by the Evangelical Synod of North America. Price per year (six numbers) $2.00; to foreign countries, $2.20. Rev. H. Kamphausen, Dr. theol. (Giessen Univ.), 1956 W. Boulevard, Cleveland, Ohio, Editor.

All communications relating to editorial work, all contributions and exchanges must be addressed to the editor.

All communications relating to business matters must be addressed to Eden Publishing House, 1712-24 Chouteau Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

VOL. 60 ST. LOUIS, MO. JAN. 1

RELIGION IN AN ERA OF READJUSTMENT

By Professor Elmer E. Arndt

The tapestry of history is woven of two kinds of threads: continuity and variation. The ultimate problems that confront men, and the values they esteem do not change radically in essence. The types of institutions that characterize the sociological structure of society remain very much the same. In primitive as well as in modern society we find the basic organizations of state, religious institutions, and family. But these considerations should not obscure the fact that civilizations do change, and, indeed, that one civilization can be replaced by another, as happened after the fall of the Roman Empire. New situations and increasing complexity of social relationships impose on existing institutions the obligation to discover new technique which will be more adequate to cope with novel situations. The fallacy of assuming that since the fundamental aspirations and hopes of men do not change, therefore the form in which esteemed values have been presented should not change, leads to stagnation and ultimately to the practical replacement of those values by another scheme of values and the declining influence of the institution which was entrusted with their propagation and enrichment. It is, indeed, the teaching of history that the ultimate justification of institutions and the condition of their survival is the vigor with which they incarnate in concrete situations the values which they represent and the relevance of their teaching to contemporary life. The institution which, believing its value to be ultimate, does not concern itself with adjusting its teaching or modifying its manner of presenta-

V.60
1932

tion or gaining new insights, cannot long survive. Religious institutions should be in the best sense conservative; actually, the conservatism is often more like inertia; yet religious institutions like other institutions can afford to neglect the currents of life and thought around them only at their peril.

On the other hand, to assume that history has no lessons to teach us because a situation is novel is to expose ourselves to all the pitfalls which lie in the path of human striving and which a profounder reading of history would help us to avoid. The type of thought which would hold that all things are new and therefore all that is represented in the accumulated experience of the race is useless is just as much in error as that type which would impose rigid categories hallowed by the centuries on the novel. To refuse the wisdom of the ages is to condemn all our efforts, no matter how enthusiastic, to impotency.

If these considerations are valid, then it is the obligation of that institution which claims to represent the highest values continually to examine the relevance of its ideals to and the effectiveness of its program in contemporary situations. For it is only as the church strives to incarnate the values of religion in concrete events that it can maintain their vigor, and by the vigorous application of its ideals to historical events point the way to the superhistorical and the transcendent.

Without a clear understanding of the character of the civilization in which they live, the advocates of religion are apt to misdirect their energies and proclaim ideals without realizing their implications. It is important, therefore, to discover what are the characteristics of the world in which we live. We have to ask ourselves. Is the present era an era of readjustment? and, To what factors is it necessary to make readjustment?

It would be beyond the scope of this essay to enter into an exhaustive analysis of the modern world. It is only possible here to attempt to suggest certain basic elements which may suggest the extent of the changes which are occurring, and their character. I shall, therefore, limit myself to three distinct, though related fields, and attempt to point out the changes that are taking place.

The most striking characteristic of modern life when we compare it with the Middle Ages is its atomic character. The invention of the machine and the ensuing Machine Age have brought in their train a number of consequences. The factory system stimulated and accentuated the trend toward the cities so that our civilization becomes increasingly urban in character; the structure of modern life becomes increasingly megalopolitan. The perfection of machine production and the development of investment banking has made for an increasing impersonalization of human relation-

ships. The control of the means of production is vested in individuals who have no knowledge of the actual operation of the factory and no relations to those who are employed. The management is vested in experts who are responsible for the operation of the factory and the accumulation of profits. The tendency of modern economic organization is to increase the gap between those who own the means of production and those who are employed to operate the machinery.

The significance of these well known facts is that individuals find themselves in a society to which they have no organic relations. First, the trend towards the cities divorced man from the soil and thus from a life which was rooted in stable customs and ordered according to the succession of nature. Then mass production threw numbers of men together but at the same time destroyed their relations to the owners of the means of production and to the product which they produced. Further, the difficulty which labor unions experience in organizing workers gives evidence of the disintegration of relationships between those engaged in a common task. The second effect, then, of machine production has been to destroy the relations between man and his fellows. The individual becomes a mere unit with no organic relation to either the soil or his felowmen.

But besides this fact of the disintegration of human relationships is the collectivistic character of modern life. The question before us is not whether or not we shall have a collectivistic society but rather what kind of collectivism shall we have. Collectivism is a fact. The trend toward combination and centralization involves the throwing together of men in large numbers. Factories no longer employ hundreds but thousands and tens of thousands. This collectivism is, however, not characterized by organic bonds which fuse it into a unity but rather by merely accidental and external relations which create not a society but rather a mass. Any significant attempt to deal with the problems of modern society must keep these two factors in view. Paradoxical though it may seem, modern life becomes increasingly collectivistic and atomic. These characteristics reveal themselves not only in the realm of economic activity but in the fields of politics and education as well.

The present depression has accentuated and brought clearly into view the atomic-collectivistic character of modern society. But the depression is of greater significance than that it merely threw into bold relief latent factors. It has occasioned a questioning of our whole capitalistic civilization as the interest in the Russian experiment indicates. And well it might, if the depression does, as the evidence suggests, mark the end of an era. We have passed the era of expansion and the era of contraction has set in. This is a

fact of profound significance and its effects are already beginning to be felt. Even the time-honored economic virtues have been reversed so that thrift has lost its halo of respectability and spending has taken its place.

What is the significance of this transition from an expanding to a contracting economic order? What difference will it make in the relations between men and social groups?

Before we attempt an answer it is well to consider the fact that if there is any element which binds our society together into a unity it is the spirit of money-making. The orgy of gambling, that has been dignified by the name of speculation, just before the crash of the stock market witnesses to the homage that America pays to what William James called the "bitch goddess of prosperity." It is from the lust for prosperity that individualism, as it finds expression in contemporary political utterances, draws its vitality. And it is this spirit of money-making which prompts and sanctions the appropriation of federal money for feed for cows and pigs but denies that same food to men. It is just this very element which superficially seems to give cohesion to our society which is its most divisive factor. For great fortunes can be built only by appropriating the wealth which others or nature has produced. That is to say, the very element which gives modern life its unity is itself divisive.

What, then, will be the significance of the transition from an era in which the probabilities of achieving wealth were great to an era in which the probabilities are greatly decreased?

First, there will be increased effort on the part of those who are the possessors of wealth and the privilege which accompanies it to protect their possessions. It is utopian to suppose that those who are in possession of privilege will in any significant degree surrender their privilege. Nor are signs lacking that this process is already well developed. The rich have found a ready ally in the state ever since Chief Justice Marshall erected the doctrine of the rights of property into a cardinal principle of American jurisprudence. Privilege is too valuable to be surrendered easily, for it means social prestige, the advantages of culture and education, and power.

As contraction involves the increasing effort to protect inherited privilege so conversely it means for the underprivileged a growing consciousness of class. As the opportunities for rising from the working to the capitalist or bourgeois class decrease the workers will become more and more conscious of their position. Already in our civilization the skilled worker is being increasingly demoted to the unskilled class with the advance of technological improvements and the white-collar worker is beginning to find

himself subject to the same economic insecurity that haunts the manual laborer.

These two factors, the attempt of the privileged to protect their possessions and the growing class consciousness of the workers as they realize their position means an accentuation of the class-struggle. That is to say, the significant ethical problems which confront our modern age are problems of the relationship of groups to each other.

The present struggle between worker and capitalist has revealed and continues to reveal the unethical character of modern civilization. For in order to protect their privileges and wealth—very often privilege and wealth acquired and enjoyed without any corresponding exercise of function—against the claims of those who are producers, namely the workers, the capitalists have resorted to force and not unsuccessfully appealed to the state for support. Strikers find themselves opposed by police as well as by private detectives; meetings of strikers are forbidden or broken up; picketing is declared unlawful; leaders are arrested. Injunctions are awarded by the courts to the management and are enforced with all the might of the state. How deeply the element of force—which is the weapon of a social order that has no integral character—has entered into the relations between the privileged and the underprivileged may be gathered from some recent occurrences. Mooney and Billings are kept in jail, despite their proved innocence, because they championed the right of the worker against injustice. Sacco and Vanzetti are executed more for their political and economic opinions than for the dubious commission of a crime. In short, the capitalist state has thrown the full weight of its juridicial power on the side of those who possess privilege.

The union of privilege and force is again apparent in the modern religion of nationalism which is capable of generating tremendous emotion but has no capacity for self-criticism. In its glorification of the state it apotheosizes national ambition and endows the lust for power and wealth with divine sanction. While it rattles the sword at all those who would challenge the state and its position, it suppresses all those at home who would question the established order or seek to establish an egalitarian society. In seeking to create an integrated society it employs the method of might which history shows is ultimately destructive.

Another symptom of change in our contemporary society is found in the race situation. The title of Allain Locke's book, *The New Negro,* is significant. The docility and content which characterized the negro before the World War has gone. The negro has discovered himself as a member of a race with a rich cultural heritage, with a unique cultural task, and with the necessary gen-

ius to accomplish this task. He has found a new self-respect for himself and his race. He has seen representatives of his race win recognition through intrinsic merit in fields of cultural and professional attainment.

Having found his worth, the new negro resents the gratuitous insults which a predominant white civilization imposes on him. The persistent attempt of the white man to enforce discriminations against the negro can only generate open race conflict. Political and social discriminations ultimately defeat their own purpose. They reveal and help to generate lower motives and actions than those attributed to the ones against whom discriminations are practiced. Discriminations are the soil in which those volcanic eruptions of barbarism called lynching are nurtured.

The type of civilization, furthermore, which encourages and permits the use of racial antagonisms in the service of money-making stands self-condemned. For the life of civilization depends on the cooperation, not the hostility, of its component groups.

Against this whole procedure the new negro revolts and claims justice for himself and his race. He has won his education with suffering and hardships and he will not be denied. Those who imagine that the solution of the race problem lies solely in educating the negro are blind to the fact that the educated man feels more keenly the unjust discriminations to which he is subject and resents more deeply the attempt to relegate him to a lower position in society. With the education of the negro there must also be a process of eradication of prejudice from the heart of the white man and the progressive removal of social and political discriminations if we are to attain some measure of racial harmony.

It is largely because the church has refused to deal rigorously with this situation and, while preaching that in Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek, sanctioned within its own walls discriminations against him, that the negro is leaving the church in increasing numbers. The work of the communists in uniting black laborers and white on a basis of absolute equality constitutes a challenge both to the sincerity and moral earnestness of the representatives of religion.

The disintegration of social life has made for chaos in individual lives. The modern man not only finds himself unrelated to his fellowmen and his world but likewise finds his own personality confused and containing conflicting elements.

This disintegration of the inner life has been due in part to the breakdown of authority, that is, the destruction of a dominating and organizing life purpose. The real significance of the breakdown of authority does not consist in the displacement of previously accepted forms of authority such as church or Bible, but in the

fact that the purpose they represented and the integration and order they gave to life have disappeared. The external form broke down only after the content which the form symbolized had ceased to be a potent factor in human life.

The history of the breakdown of religious authority is known well enough. The Reformation destroyed the authority of the church and later historical criticism destroyed the authoritative biblicism which orthodox protestantism sought to substitute for the church. At first men thought that science could take the seat from which religion had been driven, but it soon became evident that the very nature of scientific method precluded it from maintaining such a position. For it is of the very essence of scientific method to be tentative and piece-meal. Its test of the value of an hypothesis is pragmatic, that is, its fruitfulness for further investigation and the number of facts which it explains. Indeed, science does not find it necessary to achieve a too rigid consistency, and can even use different hypotheses to explain different aspects of the same phenomenon, as is the case at present in the two theories used in the explanation of light.

The first result of the breakdown of authority was the growth of the cult of self-expression which is still widely prevalent. With the loss of a dominating purpose the ideal became self-realization interpreted as meaning the unrestrained expression and fulfilment of uncriticized impulses. With all its emphasis on expression, this attitude is really the attitude of despair, despair of any meaning in life and of any rational purpose. For the glory of God as the end of life was substituted the glory of immediate impulse which is a sickness unto death. For it is of the very essence of conscious life to order and organize its elements and therefore subordinate momentary impulses to an inclusive purpose which is operative, although never fully realized, in history.

The despair of the modern man finds its intellectual expression in humanism, which has a double root. On the one hand, it has seen how the acids of science have corroded the structure on which life was previously based. And on the other hand, it sees in the discoveries of physical science, especially the discovery of the immensity of the universe and its apparent indifference to human values and the consequent insignificance of man, the denial of any ultimate significance to human values and purposes. Humanism has been too earnest to fall into the easy fallacies of the cult of self-expression; but it shares with it its egocentricity. For while it is characterized on the one hand by interest in cosmology, it is characterized on the other by its emphasis on the good life interpreted in individualistic terms. Its contention that the values esteemed by man have no support in the universe rests on the as-

sumption that the good life conceived in mundane terms must have cosmic support and the refusal to recognize as justifiable an ideal couched in supra-mundane terms. In its emphasis on the individual conceived as what he is in the spatio-temporal world, it is but the logical conclusion of the liberal protestant over-emphasis on the value of the individual and reveals the weakness of this one-sided presentation of the matter.

The natural and inevitable conclusion of this excessive individualism is a lack of moral energy. The wise man—if Walter Lippmann may be taken as the type—has no desire to enter into the conflicts of life nor take a part in the reconstruction of society on a more rational and ethical basis. Rather, he prefers to stand on the side and watch the turmoil. It is a terrible vengeance which Bertrand Russell's God has accomplished. He now becomes the prototype of wisdom. The indifference of the universe finds its counterpart in the indifference of the sophisticated.

Thus the Protestant churches find themselves confronted by a world which is entering into a new period of economic history and which yet tries to hold the passing era in its grasp by refusing to recognize the change and by employing such subversive measures as high tariffs and subsidies rather than make intelligent adjustment. A world which, while it proclaims democracy and signs Kellogg pacts, still places its main reliance on force in order to maintain the power of the dominant class at home and the prestige of the nation abroad. A world which is torn by racial conflict and animosity because the dominant white race refuses elementary justice, not to mention the failure to apply the principles of Christianity, to the colored races. A world which seeks for certainty but finds only despair. A world which, facing problems that demand courage, steadfastness and heroic measures, is characterized by a lack of moral energy and stupidity.

THE GLORY OF THE CROSS

Sermon Sketches for the Lenten Season

Frederick Stoerker

First Lenten Service

Subject: The Cross: The Altar of Intercession.

Text: "Father forgive them; for they know not what they do." Luke 23: 34.

The cross in the days of Jesus and the apostles a symbol of shame. No more shameful death to be imagined than the death on the cross. Much of Jewish and Gentile opposition to the early Christian message due to the central place of the cross in Christian teaching.

What a change the centuries have wrought. On altars and church spires no more appropriate symbol. In Christian thought it stands not only for sacrifice, but also for triumph. "In the cross of Christ I glory" one of the great songs of the church.

The cross glorified by the Christ who died upon it. Its glory radiated through the words he spoke while suffering upon it. The first word reveals the cross as

The Altar of Intercession

I. It is the fulfilment of a sacred institution of the old covenant.

1. Offerings central in old testament cult. The significance of the altar of incense. While smoke rose before the holy of holies, symbolizing the presence of God, the officiating priest interceded for the people. From this altar he went before the congregation of Israel to bless them in the name of Jehovah.

2. This altar of intercession passed away because it found its glorious fulfilment in the cross of Calvary, where Christ interceded. The altar of incense a symbol remembered, the cross of Christ the power unto salvation which "through all time abides."

II. It is the consummate expression of the Savior's life-long desire for the salvation of mankind.

1. The life of our Lord replete with intercession. For individual followers (Luke 22: 31, 32). For disciples collectively (John 17: 11); for all believers of all times (John 17: 21). From these instances we may draw conclusions as to the intercessory contents of the many unrecorded prayers of Jesus.

2. Noblest height of intercession reached in this prayer for his enemies. Pilate, Herod, Sanhedrin, soldiers, Judas, etc., all immediate objects of this prayer. "For they know not what they do"—Jesus would claim the full extent of divine mercy for them. Was it not also a prayer for us, whose sin is enmity against God?

III. It inspires us to follow in the footsteps of Jesus by availing ourselves of the privilege of intercession.

1. In the scope of our intercession. "Love your enemies . . . pray for them . . ." Do we rise to that height?

2. In the spirit of our intercession—his spirit.

3. In the argument he uses, also used by Peter (Acts 3: 17) and Paul (Acts 17: 30) in behalf of Jew and Gentile, and wholly or relatively true of all enemies of the cross.

By a life corresponding to the profession of this spirit we too can show forth the glory of the cross.

Second Lenten Service

Subject: The Cross: The Fount of Pardon.

Text: "Verily I say unto thee, Today shalt thou be with me in Paradise." Luke 23: 43.

"There is a fountain filled with blood"—this once beloved song of the church now seldom sung. Yet the truth therein expressed, the reconciliation of man with God and the forgiveness of sin through the death of Christ upon the cross, remains. A glorious truth! The glory of the cross thus consists also therein that it is

The Fount of Pardon

I. As such it is again the fulfilment of an old testament institution: the sin-offering (Lev. 4 and 5).

1. The principal sin-offering in Israelitish cult brought on Day of Atonement, by high priest, for people. But a sin-offering could also be brought by an individual. Always, except in case of very poor people (Lev. 5: 11), an animal offering with shedding of blood. See also Heb. 9: 22.

2. Christ, by his death on the cross obtained an eternal redemption (Heb. 9: 12). Whether we hold to one of the traditional theories of the atonement or not, it remains true: "He died that we might be forgiven."

II. This glorious truth is proclaimed by the suffering Savior in the second word from the cross.

1. Whosoever comes to him in repentance, confessing his sin, and believing, receives forgiveness. Note the presence of these three elements in the words of the dying thief.

2. One's past life not a hindrance to divine mercy. The dying thief often represented as an example of death-bed conversion. Not necessarily true. May have been reviving influence of godly parent long dead or forsaken. May have been due to some previous contact with Jesus. But though he came in last hour, he was received.

3. The assurance given by this word reaches into eternity.

III. The experience of the cleansing power of the cross as the fount of pardon teaches us the lesson of forebearance towards our fellowmen and devoted service to God.

1. Introduce the argument of the parable of the unmerciful servant (Matt. 18: 23-35). How, having experienced God's mercy, can one be uncharitable towards those offending against him?

2. The pardoned sinner a redeemed person. Redeemed from sin. Redeemed unto what? A life of service among the brethren. Service prompted by love. Love alive in proportion to sense of forgiveness (Luke 7: 40-50).

Live the life that reflects the glory of the cross as the fount of pardon!

Third Lenten Service

Subject: The Cross: The Tie That Binds.

Text: "Woman, behold, thy son! . . . Behold, thy mother!" John 19: 26, 27.

Not all beneath the cross are enemies of the Lord. Some friends, one disciple, and the Lord's mother. Already of one heart and soul, their later life found them bound together more firmly than ever by their mutual sojourn at the foot of the cross. The third word glorifies it as

The Tie That Binds

I. It binds the hearts of parent and child together in the bonds of undying love.

1. Mary's love to Jesus so great that she follows him all the way to Calvary. The disciples, with one exception, had forsaken him, but Mary stood beneath the cross.

2. The love of Jesus for his mother equally enduring. Though suffering severely, though his life mission weighed heavily upon him, though surrounded by enemies, though mocked and despised, his thoughts went out to his mother. Her welfare his concern even on the cross.

3. Frequently bonds uniting child and parent become loose with passing of time. Parents early let child shift for itself with great detriment to its character. Children let parents suffer in old age while they themselves enjoy life. The one remedy is more of that love which bound mother and son together on Calvary. A Christian home life most essential.

II. It unites Christ's followers in the alleviation of suffering among the poor.

1. Mary had been the wife of a humble carpenter. She was the mother of a family of at least seven children (Mark 6: 3). She had become a widow before the death of Jesus and now faced

the days of old age without having laid up means of sustenance. John, son of a fisherman, not wealthy, but in the strength of youth. Cared for Mary as for his own mother.

2. The charitable spirit of John towards Mary to be emulated by the followers of Jesus individually and unitedly. Evidence of this spirit: Large part of support of community chests (some say 90%) contributed by Christian people. Greater but most necessary objective: Regard for humanity by placing person above profit and product in industry. Social righteousness.

III. The cross also unites Christians in this effort to make Christ King of kings and Lord of lords.

1. The unique and valuable characteristics of John's gospel record, probably due not only to his intimate personal relation to Jesus, but to his associations with the Lord's mother. Their interests thus united in his cause.

2. The divisions of Christendom the greatest drawback to the progress of the Kingdom. Unity of Christians an essential prerequisite to its coming (John 17: 21). Beneath the cross all can be one. Symbol common to Christian faith of both Protestant and Catholic. Cross has unifying power transcending natural and racial differences.

Lift high the cross of Christ!
Tread where his feet have trod:
As brothers of the Son of Man
Rise up, O men of God!

Fourth Lenten Service

Subject: The Cross: The Shrine of Faith.

Text: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Matt. 27: 46.

Let us proceed reverently as we approach the cross today. Calvary, that rugged hill, is holy ground, and today we approach its holiest shrine. No deeper mystery anywhere than in the fourth word from the cross. Nowhere a more resplendent glory, if we approach this mystery in faith. For in the light of our text the cross is

The Shrine of Faith

I. Let us first visit another shrine, one which comes more nearly within the reach of human thought and word: the sanctuary of the old dispensation.

1. Enter its court: The altar of burnt offerings, the brazen laver. Understandable symbols to Israel.

2. So also those of the holy place: Candlestick, table of the showbread, altar of incense.

3. But beyond the curtain, in the holy of holies, on the ark, between the cherubim the cloud of the divine presence. This a mystery, but enshrouding the heart of Israel's faith.

II. The cross of Calvary in the light of our text a holier shrine. Fairly satisfying interpretation of first three words possible. Not so of this one. It flowed from the innermost soul of the crucified one, from a deeper depth than we can penetrate.

1. Burden of sin of the world.

2. Sense of God's wrath against sin.

3. Both weigh so heavily upon his soul that they outweigh the sense of fellowship with God as Father, which was so great a source of joy and strength to him during his ministry.

These are some of the mysterious depths of the cross made known, but not laid open, by fourth word. "We have ventured into the mystery as far as we are able; but we know that we are yet only in the shallows of the shore; the unplummed ocean lies beyond." (Stalker)

"We may not know, we cannot tell
What pains he had to bear;
But we believe it was for us
He hung and suffered there."

That the glory of this shrine. Cannot fathom its mystery, but by faith find salvation.

II. As we worship at this shrine we experience the love of the Eternal One.

1. The love of the Father, who gave his Son (John 3: 16).

2. The love of the Son, who humbled himself (Phil. 2: 5-11).

3. The love of the Spirit, who at the foot of the cross bears witness with our spirit, that we are children of God (Rom. 8: 16).

Worship often in faith before this shrine.

Fifth Lenten Service

Subject: The Cross: The Depth of Love.

Text: "I thirst." John 19: 28.

Soldiers who were wounded on the battlefield and lay in the pain of their wounds for a time tell us that in the course of an hour or two all their suffering combines in a most agonizing thirst. Thus the fifth word from the cross not our common expression, "I am thirsty," but a cry from the depth of greatest physical pain. Observed in its setting it reveals the Savior's invincible love.

The Depth of Love

I. The only word from the cross pertaining to the Lord's physical suffering uttered only after Jesus knew that all things were now accomplished.

1. Even on the cross the object of his Father's love in sending his Son was first and uppermost in his mind. This seen from the first three words. Then follows the cry of soul agony. Thereafter, and not before, do his thoughts turn to his physical suffering.

2. Throughout life he had loved others first and himself last. Though rich, he became poor for our sakes (2 Cor. 8: 9). He could promise mansions, but had not where to lay his head. He was the bread of life, but himself hungered. Could give water of life, but now thirsts.

3. We, too, can enrich the lives of our fellowmen only as we love ourselves last. See Elmhurst Hymnal, appendix, p. 50.

II. The love of our Lord is also revealed therein that this word is addressed to his enemies.

1. His friends not likely to have been prepared to quench his thirst. If he is to receive a cooling draught it must be administered by his enemies. The dying Savior thus manifests a kindly confidence toward those who were even then executing him. What faith in humanity!

2. He is not disappointed. Those who administered the last kindness to the Lord may hardly have realized the privilege that was theirs and the opportunity of which they availed themselves. We cannot but think kindly of them and love them for it.

3. The Lord in his deep love for men, yet thirsts for deeds of love from them. His cry comes to us through all who are in manifest need of body or soul. Whatsoever is done for them is done for him (Matt. 25: 40). He is confident that his followers will thus serve him. This confidence honors them and offers them life's greatest opportunity. "We love (and serve) because he first loved us."

Sixth Lenten Service

Subject: The Cross: The Crown of Perfection.

Text: "It is finished." John 19: 30.

"Durch Kreuz zur Krone!"—This word illustrated by the passage in Phil. 2: 5-11, relating the humiliation and exaltation of Christ. The cross the consummation of his humiliation, but also in a very real sense the beginning of his exaltation and triumph. He had himself foretold this (John 12: 32). By the sixth word the cross appears to us as

The Crown of Perfection

I. The sixth word the word of the guildsman or artist who is elated over the perfection of the product of his labors. "It is finished in every respect! It could not be better!" Thus Jesus,

looking back over his life work, found that he had fulfilled his mission in every respect. Nothing remained to be done.

1. As a teacher he had given the world instructions which, if followed, would give life eternal values.

2. As a man of power he had opened up resources, which, if used by his followers, could reshape the world.

3. As the Son of God he had made the Father known as fully as man was able to behold him.

4. As the Lamb of God he had given his life into death, having drunk the cup of suffering without murmuring to the very dregs of it. All told: He had wrought a perfect salvation.

II. We have thus only to come unto him to learn of him, to take his yoke upon us and to find rest (Matt. 11: 28).

Tell of Ebenezer Wooton, an earnest but essentric evangelist, who once, when asked by a seeking soul, "What must I do to be saved?", said: "Too late, my friend, too late . . . you're hundreds of years too late. The work of salvation is done . . ." (See F. W. Boreham, "A Handful of Stars," chapter 9).

Tell of the life of Hudson Taylor, whose life was lived in the conviction that "since the whole work was finished and the whole debt paid on the cross, there was nothing for him to do but to fall upon his knees and accept the Savior and praise him for ever." (Boreham).

III. These words not a pillow for the indifferent. No one really appreciates their glorious meaning who does not find in them a challenge and a summons.

1. He has left us an example, etc.

2. Be ye therefore perfect, etc.

Finished lives (relatively speaking) possible in the strength of Jesus. "My grace is sufficient for thee . . . my power is made perfect in weakness."

Seventh Lenten Service

Subject: The Cross: The Way to the Father.

Text: "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit." Luke 23: 46.

All things being accomplished and his work finished, Jesus can resignedly face death. He knows that beyond its gates there awaits him the "Well done" of him who had sent him into the world. He now turns to him and commends the spirit which is about to leave his suffering frame into his hands. The cross thus becomes for him

The Way to the Father

I. The way to the Father is gained by a growing acquaintance with God in his fatherly relation.

1. God always very real to Jesus. Even in his childhood days there dawned on him a growing sense of his special relation to God. As a boy in the temple he gives the world the first recorded utterance of this conviction. His public ministry constantly reveals it. Its supreme revelation this word from the cross.

2. We gain the conviction of God's fatherhood towards us in the same way in which it grew upon Jesus. His seventh word directs us. The way is that of prayer, which is communion with the Father. Jesus had always thus come unto him, and thus he approached him in death. If we would be able to behold the Father's kindly face when we face death, we must now practice the fellowship of prayer. The way is furthermore that of Bible-study. It is from the Scriptures that Jesus takes the words of his last prayer. Lay up in your memory treasures from the sacred writings and their comfort will be yours in your last hour.

II. The way to the Father is gained by a growing acquaintance with suffering.

1. The cross not the first experience of suffering in the life of Jesus. Simply the consummation of it. His sadness over sin and death, his not being received by his own people, the growing opposition against him, his rejection by the rulers, his being brought into the court of the Romans—then the cross. All this before he could return to the Father.

2. Greatest suffering caused by opposition to and rejection of efforts unselfishly made for the good of others, in behalf of the righting of social wrongs and in behalf of the coming of the kingdom. Christ's followers not exempt from these experiences as they go the way to the Father.

"I must needs go home by the way of the cross." Note successively Matt. 16: 24; Acts 14: 22; Rom. 8: 17; Rev. 7: 14.

DOES OUR CONFIRMATION TRADITION NEED REVITALIZING?

O. W. Wagner

Unless traditions are evaluated in the light of present needs and current experiences they are apt to lose their significance and become a meaningless "going through the motions". Dr. S. Kinchelow tells the story of the man whose auto was wrecked. Thereafter when he walked to his office he habitually stuck out his arm at every corner. Approached by a friend, he was asked, "Why do you put your arm out like that?" His answer was, "That's all I have left of my car".

Is that all we have left of confirmation? Is it merely going through the motions? Is it merely a period of time that climaxes in girls wearing white dresses and boys donning long pants? Is it only a time to memorize the catechism? Is it graduating from the church school into the privilege of staying away from church? Why is there such a loss of young people in so many churches? Has confirmation lost its challenge for youth? One might ask: Did it ever have a challenge? Can it have a challenge?

A description of a typical confirmation class will help us to re-study the objectives of catechetical instruction. It will carry this discussion from the theoretical to the actual. How many confirmation classes are not a duplicate of this type?

The Minister announces the time for the beginning session and the parents *send* their children of confirmation age, that age, as a rule, being from twelve to fourteen. The meeting place is the local Church and the time is late afternoon twice a week or on Saturday morning. The Minister begins by asking, how many have a Catechism? and the answers vary, depending upon the number of children who have older brothers and sisters. In that case they do not need to buy a catechism for it seldom changes. The class will be required to memorize the verses explained in one session by the next class meeting. Four or five questions and answers is approximately a week's work.

The first question is, "What should be the chief concern of man?" Answer: "Man's chief concern should be the eternal salvation of his soul." For proof of this important first concern of man the following two bible passages are quoted: "Seek ye first His kingdom and His righteousness: And all these things shall be added unto you." "For what shall a man be profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and forfeit his life? or what shall a man give in exchange for his life?"

The necessity of saving your soul is emphasized by picturing the awfulness of a lost soul—a soul condemned to hell. A desire

to have your soul saved is evoked and the second question brings that note. "How can you secure the eternal salvation of your soul?" Answer: "We secure the eternal salvation of our soul through faith in our Lord Jesus Christ." Proof texts for this answer are given and memorized.

The third verse is explained by quoting 2 Peter 1, 21. "For no prophecy ever came by the will of man: but man spoke from God, being moved by the Holy Ghost." The minister impresses the sacredness of the Word upon the Confirmands and tells them that it is the infallible guide to eternal life. The fourth and fifth questions and answers are hurriedly given because the time is almost up and the Bible story has not yet been told. "What are the contents of the Holy Scriptures?" "The contents of the Holy Scriptures are the law and the gospel." Question 5. "Where do you find the law of God in a concise form?". Answer: "We find the law of God concisely expressed in the Ten Commandments." The children are instructed to memorize these answers by the next class meeting and to be able to quote the Bible verses that prove the answers. A sigh expressing the severity of the task moves the minister to say that not every day will they have five verses to memorize, "but they are so short you can easily learn them by heart after a few minutes of study."

Thus from September to Easter the class meets for catechetical instruction. By the end of this period the class has been given a thoroughly sincere orthodox opinion regarding the Ten Commandments, the three articles of faith dealing with God and His work of Creation, with Jesus Christ and his work of redemption, and with the Holy Ghost and the work of sanctification; they have memorized verses regarding prayer, the Lord's Supper and Baptism; and have studied corresponding Bible stories. The Sunday before Palm Sunday is "Prüfung" or examination day. The public must see that the memorization has been complete. Palm Sunday is the acme—a great Church festival—new dresses, new suits, a church full of people, flowers and decorations. The Minister presents each child with a confirmation diploma and gives each confirmand the right hand of fellowship, thus ending the confirmation period.

If we agree that religious education is an initiation of the young into a creative social and personal experience in which we begin with the learner's own experience, interpreting it in the light of the race's experience, so that the learner can respond intelligently to any given situation; we are prone to ask: "Does this tradition of memorizing a given body of authoritative knowledge lead growing boys and girls to face their own problems and to interpret their own experience in such a way as to enable them

to respond intelligently to all experiences in life, and to live radiantly and God-consciously in their day and age?

A careful study of our tradition would lead us to the following conclusions which are in general the same as those worked out by a Seminar at the University of Chicago in which the writer cooperated.

1. The Typical catechism consists of a logically arranged series of questions and answers, stereotyped in form, and encouraging little if any free critical personal judgment.

2. The catechism is not graded in the psychological sense. Few adaptations are made on the basis of the extent and complexity of the material.

3. The chief use of the catechism is in the preparation of candidates for church membership, or entrance into the full life of the church through confirmation. The satisfactory mastery of the catechism is prerequisite to confirmation.

4. In content the catechism consists of statements as to doctrines, liturgy, organization, discipline, practices of the church, together with exhortations and moral precepts.

5. The statements in the catechism are largely based on proof texts from the Bible, from traditional sources, and from authoritative persons.

6. The chief method used in the teaching and study of the catechism is drill and memorization. Skillful catechists vary this method by using the statement in the catechism as a point of departure for further explanation and discussion, or the inductive method may be employed to arrive at *a priori* generalizations.

Perhaps we have been content to go on catechizing our confirmands (instead of helping them to discover religious significances in their own life situations by interpreting their experiences in such a way as to develop a permanent and wholehearted devotion to religion) because we have been laboring under faulty assumptions. How many of us have not had the following assumptions regarding our confirmation tradition?

1. It is assumed that the immature individual needs religious instruction, but that the end is not knowledge merely but appropriate conduct and character.

2. It is assumed that the instruction given in the catechism will influence the child's heart and will.

3. A church needs intelligent and efficient members, and it is assumed that mastery of the catechism will produce good churchmanship, based on knowledge of essential beliefs, of the genius of the institution itself, of its liturgies and practices. Instruction in the catechism, it is held, will prepare for participation in the full life of the mature congregation.

4. The catechism assumes that there is an authoritative body of revealed and final truth which should be handed down from one generation to another, the exact statement of which is important.

5. The underlying theory of this type of education is that it is a process of inculcating adult ideas, beliefs, and practices so that they will come to be the unchanged possession of each oncoming generation.

6. The desired results in conduct and character will be brought about through engendering habit-patterns of thought which will express themselves appropriately in life situations.

7. It is generally assumed that the formal beliefs thus acquired will carry over into conduct, although many who use the method recognize that other means must be used to supplement instruction in the conditioning of moral behavior.

The writer offers the following criteria as a basis for evaluating the confirmation tradition. These criteria were worked out by him in conjunction with a professor and a Director of Religious Education. The criteria are not only a good basis for evaluating confirmation, but if stated positively, they are worthy objectives for any minister in his teaching task.

I. *Confirmation in regard to the learner:*

1. To what extent does it utilize the learner's past experience?

2. To what extent does it provide for the enrichment of the learner's present experience as it moves toward future experience?

3. To what extent does it provide for individual differences?

4. To what extent does it help growing persons to adjust themselves to a developing situation?

5. To what extent does it develop desirable social conceptions and attitudes?

6. To what extent does it develop a permanent and wholehearted devotion to religion?

7. To what extent does it contribute to the development of a church membership that is

a. Intelligent
b. Effective
c. Self-evaluating?

8. To what extent does it help the learner to discover religious significance in every experience and to reconstruct that experience in the light of such significance?

II. *Confirmation in regard to the Teacher:*

1. To what extent is the function of the teacher that of guidance?

2. To what extent is the function of the teacher in accord with the above basic assumptions?

3. To what extent does it provide the teacher with opportunity to get a complete view of the learner's experience and to lead on to new areas?

III. *Confirmation in relation to Content:*

1. To what extent does the procedure use a sufficient amount of racial experience?

2. To what extent does the learner help determine the content, procedure and outcome?

3. To what extent does adult society help determine the content procedure, and outcome?

4. To what extent do the learner and adult society *cooperate* in determining the content, procedure, and outcome?

5. To what extent is motivation intrinsic?

IV. Confirmation in relation to Practical Situations:

1. To what extent does it adapt itself to existing conditions as determined by

a. Age of group
b. Time element
c. Equipment
d. Preparation of group?

2. To what extent does it provide for self-criticism of the process?

3. To what extent does it help build up generalizations that will apply in situations similar to the present concrete experience of the group?

A group of ministers, professors, and Graduate students used this set of criteria to grade the catechetical method of teaching. It may surprise some of our readers to learn that the combined judgments of these people, well-experienced in teaching methods, graded the Catechetical method 28%. According to their opinion it failed by 72% to fulfill the above criteria. Are we failing as badly as that in making confirmation a vital, creative experience in a shared search for abundant living?

Some of you will deny, and quite justifiably, that confirmation is that ineffective, but those of you who do, are the ones who have gotten away from a water-tight catechetical method in your classes. The writer made a survey of methods used by Evangelical ministers in teaching confirmation, and from this study he found at least six different types of teaching.

The survey of teaching methods used was made among three groups of ministers. Group A consisted of ministers who had been teaching confirmation classes for forty years or more. Group B consisted of those who had taught twenty years and Group C consisted of ministers who have taught less than ten years. A few summary statements are given here that grew out of this survey.

"The Catechetical method of teaching is used to a much greater degree among the groups A and B than among the ministers in Group C. This coincides with the findings in section one, namely, that a greater number of ministers in group A and B require greater portions of memorized work than do the ministers of group C.

"Groups B and C use a combination of more modern methods of teaching to a much greater degree than group A does. The life-situation and problem-centered approach is used exclusively as the method of teaching by several of the clergymen of group C, while none of group B or A use it as their *main* method of teaching.

"There is a growing resentment among the younger clergy for the purely catechetical method as can be sensed from these statements from clergymen in this group.

" 'I use about three-fourths of the time for discussion, and only one-fourth of the time for memorization, out of request from traditionalists.'

" 'We need more activity—more learning by doing, by projects, etc. At present the child who can memorize more easily is considered a better confirmand. We need a new standard.'

" 'I think the course should be changed to meet the needs of the children. The present catechism, even revised, is still over their heads, and memory work is soon forgotten. More freedom in teaching method, not adhering slavishly to books, for no two classes or two scholars are just alike.'

" 'Raise the age to 14-15 instead of 12-13. Eliminate memorizing to bare essentials. Eliminate oral examination at end of course. Include materials that would give a basis for a modern interpretation of the Bible.'

" 'One or more of the "pupil-centered" courses recommended by the International Council of Religious Education would be better than present material. I use the course, "Jesus and Problems of Life" by Weston.'

" 'I use the catechism only as a concession to the denomination and only as a source for a minimum of memory-work. I supplement it with text-books like Logingier's "My Church," "The Kingdom of Love" by Blanche Carrier, etc., etc. My method is chiefly that of discussion, investigation, with particular reference to the problems of the ages I have to deal with. . . I have had some very gratifying results, but find that a change of method is almost imperative with every class.'

"The Evangelical Tradition of confirmation will remain a cherished and valuable institution to the Church with the cooperation of a thoughtful clergy. If the clergy does not awaken to its

responsibility the Church will lose a progressive, educational movement." The least we can do is to rethink our method in the light of the criteria offered here. An article describing in some detail the more vital methods used by a growing number of our clergymen might prove very helpful.

Die Betätigung des christlichen Charakters gegenüber der eignen Persönlichkeit.

Von Prof. Dr. R. H. Grützmacher.

I.

Die christliche Ethik, deren Problemen die mit diesem Artikel beginnende Aufsatzreihe gewidmet sein soll, zerfällt in einen prinzipiell allgemeinen und in einen konkret angewandten Teil. Der erstere hat das Wesen der Sittlichkeit besonders in seinem Verhältnis zu Religion und Christentum zu untersuchen. Eine wichtige Frage aus diesem Gedankenkreis über das Gewissen des natürlichen Menschen und seine Bedeutung für die theologische Ethik wurde im letzten Novemberheft behandelt. Die spezifisch christliche Sittlichkeit hat zu ihrem Träger den christlichen Charakter. Zu diesem Begriff ist ebenso enthalten, daß die schöpfungsmäßigen Grundlagen des menschlichen Charakters von Bestand bleiben, wie daß seine Reinigung von seinen sündlichen Elementen durch einen besonderen religiös sittlichen Vorgang — die Wiedergeburt und Bekehrung — erfolgt ist. Dieser christliche Charakter besitzt eine Reihe allgemeiner Wesensmerkmale, die in den Kategorien der christlichen Tugenden und Pflichten zusammengefaßt werden.

Im Wesen eines Charakters liegt es sich zu betätigen, zu wirken. Dieser Drang zur Aktivität wird bei einem christlichen Charakter auf das Höchste gesteigert, denn nach einem Wort Luthers: „Christus ist actiosissimus in nobis." Die Objekte, gegenüber denen sich ein christlicher Charakter betätigt, sind drei: die eigene Persönlichkeit, die göttliche Welt, die irdische Welt. Infolgedessen hat **die theologische Ethik in ihrem konkret angewandtem Teil zu schildern A die Betätigung des christlichen Charakters gegenüber der eigenen Persönlichkeit, B die Betätigung gegenüber Gott, C die Betätigung gegenüber der Welt.** Wir beschreiben in diesem und im nächsten Aufsatz die Betätigung des christlichen Charakters gegenüber der eigenen Persönlichkeit und zwar I. **gegenüber seinem natürlichen, durch die Schöpfung gesetzten Wesen,** II. **gegenüber seinem geistlichen, durch die Erlösung geschaffenem Wesen.**

Der Mensch ist ein Doppelwesen, zusammengesetzt aus Leib und Seele; beides ging aus des Schöpfers Hand hervor, auf beides wirkte die Sünde und richtet sich die Erlösung in Zeit und Ewigkeit. Der Bibel ist die Unterscheidung von Soma und Nous eine Selbstverständlichkeit. Daher bleibt auch der christliche Charakter im Besitz von Leib und Seele und seine Aufgabe ist die Erhaltung, Reinigung und Förderung beider Bestandteile. **Auch der Christ hat sein leibliches Leben zu bewahren.** Aus dieser Pflicht ergiebt sich

die negative Konsequenz der entschiedenen Ablehnung des **Selbstmordes.** Seine Verwerfung unter allen Umständen ergibt sich nur aus den Prinzipien einer religiösen Ethik, während alle andern sittlichen Grundsätze versagen können. Stellt etwa eine Ethik als höchstes Ideal die Selbstvervollkommnung auf, so sind Fälle denkbar, in denen der Mensch mit aller Ehrlichkeit feststellt, daß er sich nicht mehr höher vervollkommnen kann, sondern im Gegenteil an Leib und Seele sinken muß und darum ein sittliches Recht hat, seinem Leben ein Ende zu machen. Proklamieren andre Ethiken als höchste sittliche Aufgabe die Förderung der Gesellschaft, so kann ein Mensch feststellen, daß er durch eine unheilbare Krankheit nicht mehr in der Lage ist der Gesellschaft zu nutzen, sondern sie nur durch seine Existenz belastet. Es würde dann geradezu seine Pflicht sein, die Gesellschaft von seinem Dasein zu befreien. Allein die Ueberzeugung, daß wir das Leben als eine Gabe von Gott empfangen haben und nur diesem das Recht zusteht, wie seinen Anfang so auch sein Ende zu bestimmen, bewahrt vor der Versuchung der eigenen Tötung. Sind die meisten Motive des Selbstmordes furchtbares Leid oder schwere Schuld, so finden diese in der unbedingten christlichen Schuldvergebung und in der Stärkung gegen jedes Leid ihr volles Gegengewicht. — Kann darum die christliche Ethik im Prinzip dem Selbstmord keinerlei Berechtigung zugestehen, so wird sie doch dem einzelnen konkreten Fall Verständnis und vergebende Liebe entgegenzubringen haben. In die seelischen Konflikte, die einer Beendigung des Lebens durch eigene Hand vorausgehen, dringt kein andrer Mensch in dem Maß ein, daß er mit gerechtem Urteil abzuwägen vermöchte, was hier natürlicher Zwang — etwa durch besondre Anlagen —, der Druck der Verhältnisse, die Gehässigkeit andrer Menschen und was die betreffende Persönlichkeit selbst verschuldet hat. Die so oft angenommene „geistige Umnachtung" trifft — auch wenn sie sich nicht im engeren psychiatrischen Sinn nachweisen läßt — durchaus den Tatbestand. Der Selbstmörder ist in Nacht gehüllt, die weder sein und noch viel weniger eines Fremden Blick durchdringen kann. Darum ist es auch nicht eine Sache der empirischen Kirche, durch eine äußere Maßnahme, wie durch Verweigerung eines kirchlichen Begräbnisses, ein Urteil abzugeben. Sagt man etwa, daß bei jeder andern Sünde eine Bekehrung noch im letzten Augenblick möglich sei, so kann dieser „Schächeraugenblick" auch bei dem noch eintreten, der schon Hand an sich gelegt hat. Auf der andern Seite wird ein kirchliches Begräbnis fraglos einer ganzen Anzahl von Menschen zuteil, bei denen ihr gesamtes Leben und ihre Todesstunde nicht die geringsten christlichen Regungen oder Betätigungen erkennen ließen. Die Versagung eines kirchlichen Begräbnisses trifft zudem nicht den Selbstmörder, sondern seine Hin-

terbliebenen, die gerade in diesem Fall besonders der religiösen Aufrichtung bedürfen. Mit Recht haben darum in den letzten Jahrzehnten viele protestantischen Kirchen auch das Begräbnis von Selbstmördern ganz in den sonst üblichen Formen vollzogen oder es ihnen stark angenähert. **Die christliche Ethik vollzieht im Prinzip eine ebenso entschiedene Verwerfung des Selbstmordes, wie sie im konkreten Fall das letzte Urteil allein Gott überläßt.**

Ist der Christ verpflichtet — gegebenenfalls gegen die eigene Neigung — sein Leben zu erhalten, so ist er auch berechtigt, es gegen die Eingriffe von andrer Seite zu sichern. **Auch die christliche Ethik billigt das Recht der Notwehr zur Erhaltung des eigenen Lebens.** Denn kein andrer Mensch hat das Recht, mein Leben zu nehmen oder es auch nur in seiner leiblichen Kraft und Gesundheit zu schädigen. Im Prinzip ist jedoch nur das Mindestmaß der Notwehr sittlich erlaubt d. h. im konkreten Fall ist der Angreifer nur in dem Maß zurückzuschlagen, daß er kampfunfähig, ihm aber nicht seinerseits Leben und Gesundheit geraubt wird. In Wirklichkeit wird sich allerdings dieses ethische Verhältnis niemals rein herstellen lassen. Denn in Fällen eines plötzlichen Angriffes siegt der Affekt über den Verstand und der elementare Trieb der eigenen Lebenserhaltung greift leicht über das unumgängliche Maß der Verteidigung hinaus. So wird es auch hier der vergebenden Haltung Gottes bedürfen, die um so bestimmter eintreten wird, je weniger es sich um bewußte und willentliche Schädigung eines andern Menschen handelt.

Eine freiwillige Hingabe des physischen Lebens ist dem christlichen Charakter unter der Bedingung erlaubt, daß er nur durch dieses Mittel sein höherwertiges religiös-sittliches Leben erhalten kann. Mark. 10, 39 rechnet Jesus mit der Möglichkeit, ja Notwendigkeit, sein niederes Leben zu verlieren, um sein höheres Leben zu bewähren. Ein solcher Fall war für die Märtyrer gegeben, wenn sie ihr christliches Bekenntnis nur unter der Bedingung ihrer Lebenshingabe aufrecht erhalten konnten, weil sie sonst genötigt waren, dem römischen Kaiser so zu huldigen, wie sie es allein gegenüber ihrem himmlischen Herrn vermochten. Aber auch bestimmte irdische Ziele, wie die Erhaltung von Volk und Vaterland Familie und Freund können dem Christen ein Anlaß zur Aufopferung werden, wenn sie nur so diese höheren sittlichen Werte behaupten lassen.

Ist damit der Lebenshingabe ihre Grenze wie ihre Berechtigung zugemessen, so ergibt sich auf der andern Seite für den christlichen Charakter die **Pflicht der Lebenssteigerung.** Wir haben nicht nur das erhaltene Pfund zu bewahren, sondern auch für seine Mehrung und eine reichliche Zinstragung zu sorgen. Auch der Christ hat seinen Körper immer kräftiger und schöner zu gestalten und darum

positive Stellung zu solchen modernen Erscheinungen, wie es **Hygiene und Sport** sind, zu nehmen. Er wird alle Maßnahmen und Mittel vernünftiger Körperpflege bei sich und in der Gemeinschaft fördern. An Reinlichkeit, Sauberkeit Gepflegtheit soll sich ein Christ von niemand übertreffen lassen, wie ein christliches Volk gesundheitsfördernde Maßnahmen im höchsten Maß anerkennen muß.

Auch dem Sport kann das Christentum eine durchaus positive Wertung geben, zunächst unter dem Gesichtspunkt, daß er den von Gott gegebenen Leib gesund erhalten hilft und ihn kräftiger und schöner gestaltet, sodann aber auch auf Grund der Ueberlegung, daß der Sport die Lebensfreude steigert. Bei den gegenwärtigen Verhältnissen bringt der eigentliche Beruf besonders den handarbeitenden Schichten meist sehr geringe Befriedigung und Entspannung, die sie darum in anderen Formen finden müssen. Hierzu aber hilft der Sport, der mit körperlicher Ertüchtigung auch seelische Erfrischung bringt. Gerade der Jugend gibt er Ziele, die sie begeistern. Wenn so die Kirche den Sport freudig und nicht nur gezwungen anerkennt und ihm praktisch in den von ihr geleiteten Vereinigungen eine bedeutsame Stelle einräumt, hat sie auch das Recht, seine Auswüchse zu verurteilen und zu bekämpfen. Zu ihnen gehört jene durchaus nicht so seltene Form übertriebenen Sportes, der — mindestens auf die Länge — die Körperkräfte nicht stärkt, sondern schädigt. Nicht minder wird der Sport wertlos, wenn er die eigentliche Berufstätigkeit hemmt oder gar an ihre Stelle tritt — von den Menschen abgesehen, die sportliche Leistungen zu einem ernsten Lebensberuf machen.

Endlich muß vom christlichen Ethos wie von jeder geistig gerichteten Weltanschauung entschiedener Einspruch erhoben werden gegen die einseitige Verherrlichung sportlicher Leistungen. Bestand noch vor wenigen Jahrzehnten die Gefahr eines hochmütigen Herabsehens sogenannter geistiger Menschen auf die oft sehr viel Mut und Entsagung beanspruchenden körperlichen Leistungen, so wird jetzt umgekehrt von großen Massen verächtlich oder wenigstens nichtachtend auf die Denker und Dichter, Erfinder und Techniker und erst recht die Propheten und Evangelisten geschaut. Fußballspieler und Boxer sind statt dessen die eigentlichen Helden der Menschheit geworden.

Bedarf der gesunde Körper der Steigerung, so der kranke der Wiederherstellung. Bei aller Anerkennung des gottgesandten und auch erziehlichen Charakters der Krankheit, ist es **Pflicht des Christen auf Heilung des Leibes** und der meist damit zusammenhängenden seelischen Spannungen auszugehen. Jesus hat zahlreiche Kranke geheilt und darum seinen Jüngern die gleiche Aufgabe gegeben. Diese Heilung kann gewiß durch besondere religiöse Mittel, die den

Charakter von Wundern tragen, erfolgen, aber natürliche Verfahrungsweisen auszuschließen, ist kein Anlaß. Es ist durchaus nicht frömmer mit der „Christian Science" die Krankheit durch Denken zu heilen, als sie durch Medikamente und Bäder zu beseitigen. Ein wissenschaftlich gebildeter Arzt ist genau so gut ein Beauftragter Gottes wie ein sogenannter Heiler. Gott wirkt auch durch die Mittel hindurch, die er seiner Schöpfung anvertraut hat und die von der Wissenschaft in ihr entdeckt werden. Mit Recht verweigerte darum ein Amtsbruder einem andern, der die Benutzung jedes Mittels bei einer Krankheit als unfromm abgelehnt hatte, bei einem gemeinsamen Spaziergang die Mitbenutzung seines Regenschirmes, da man auch gegen die von Gott gesandte Nässe kein hinderndes Mittel anwenden dürfe.

Der Mensch besitzt aber nicht nur ganz allgemein Leib und Seele, sondern diese Urelemente tragen eine Reihe näherer Bestimmtheiten, die auch für die christliche Ethik von Bedeutung sind. Jeder Mensch hat einen individuellen Körper und eine besondre Seele. Zu den erstaunlichsten Tatsachen der göttlichen Schöpfung gehört es, daß kein Mensch dem andern völlig gleicht. Gott hat nicht Fabrikware geschaffen, sondern wie ein Künstler immer neue Originale ins Dasein gerufen. Diese **Individualität** wird dementsprechend vom Menschen im unmittelbaren Gefühl als ein besonders wertvoller Bestandteil seines Wesens empfunden, zu dessen Bewahrung und Ausbildung er sittlich verpflichtet ist. Individualität kommt von individere und bedeutet das Unteilbare, das sich nicht weiter in Bestandteile zerlegen läßt. Anderseits ist darunter auch das Besondere zu verstehen, das sich keinem Allgemeinem ein- oder unterordnet. Individualität läßt sich darum im Grund nur umschreiben, aber als ein letzter Grenzbegriff nicht mehr definieren. **Jeder Mensch besitzt als Individualität ein Plus und ein Minus gegenüber allen andern Menschen.** Der eine hat Linien in seinem Antlitz, die in dieser Form bei andern nicht zu beobachten sind; jener reagiert auf Gefühlseindrücke in einer Stärke, die sich sonst nicht beobachten läßt. Bestimmte ethische Ideale in Griechenland, aber auch im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert bei Goethe und der Romantik haben darum in der unbedingten, allseitigen und rücksichtslosen Ausbildung der Individualität die höchste Lebensaufgabe gesehen. Eine derartig entscheidende Bedeutung kann die christliche Ethik der Individualität nicht beimessen, da für sie die Einordnung jedes einzelnen Menschen in die Gemeinschaft mit Gott und dem Nächsten höher steht. Wohl aber ist auch für den christlichen Charakter die Individualität eine besondere Gabe Gottes, um deren Erkenntnis und Pflege sich der Einzelne bemühen muß. Hat Gott Originale geschaffen, so will er nicht, daß die Menschen sie in Kopien ver-

wandeln, er hat keine Freude an Dutzendgesichtern, wie sie vielfach orientalische Mönche trugen, sondern er hat sein Wohlgefallen an individuellen Charakterköpfen, wie sie den Reformatoren eigneten. Gerade der Protestantismus geht auf die Pflege der Individualität aus, mag diese auch oft für den Zusammenschluß in kirchlicher oder weltlicher Gemeinschaft schwierig oder unbequem sein. Der echt protestantische Charakter gibt auch seinem Gottesdienst eine individuelle Note, indem er sich nicht bei festen liturgischen Formeln beruhigt, sondern freie Gebete hinzufügt. Infolgedessen kann eine protestantische Ethik niemals in dem Maß, wie es die katholische Kasuistik getan hat, das sittliche Handeln in jedem einzelnen Fall vorschreiben. Selbst der seelsorgerliche Rat, der in schwierigen ethischen Fragen erbeten wird, soll sich immer dessen bewußt bleiben, daß er nur allgemeine Richtlinien ziehen kann, deren individuelle Anwendung die Sache des eigenen Gewissens ist. **Der christliche Charakter muß ein individueller sein und diese Individualität auch bei andern anerkennen.**

Bei aller Individualität eignen den Menschen von Natur eine Reihe gemeinsamer Wesensbestimmtheiten, die ethisch nicht ohne Bedeutung sind. Zu ihnen gehören die **Lebensalter.** In einer Reihe neutestamentlicher Schriften, wie in den Pastoralbriefen und in den johanneischen Briefen wendet sich der Apostel an die verschiedenen Lebensstufen mit besondern sittlichen Anforderungen. Die allgemeine christliche Sittlichkeit modifiziert sich, je nachdem ihre Forderungen an ein Kind, einen Erwachsenen oder einen Greis gerichtet werden. In der Kindheit überwiegt das sinnliche Leben das geistliche, das Wachstum ist zunächst ein vorwiegend körperliches und die geistigen Fortschritte stehen in Abhängigkeit von ihm; die Beziehung zur Welt vollzieht sich wesentlich in der Form der Rezeptivität, des Lernens. Die Aktivität tritt demgegenüber zurück und, wo sie auftritt, wird sie entweder von andern durch Befehl erzwungen oder sie vollzieht sich ohne bestimmte Zwecke in der Form des Spiels. In dieser Zeit kann naturgemäß die christliche Ethik nur in der Form des Gebotes an den Menschen herantreten und von ihm noch nicht die freie Wahl und Verwirklichung ihrer höchsten Ziele verlangen. Das wird erst möglich, wenn in der Zeit der Reife die natürlichen Voraussetzungen und Kräfte auch für das sittliche Leben erwachsen sind. Diese Lebensstufe charakterisiert sich durch die Harmonie von Leib und Seele, durch Ausgleich von Aktivität und Rezeptivität. Die Leiblichkeit wird Material für den Geist. Die Rezeptivität tritt in den Dienst der Aktivität. Jetzt besteht die Möglichkeit im Sinn des christlichen Ethos, die Natur in den Dienst des göttlichen Geistes zu stellen, in Welt und Ueberwelt die höchsten Ziele zu erkennen und zu verwirklichen. **Der christliche**

Charakter kann darum erst auf der Höhe des menschlichen Lebens entstehen. Er kann dann auch in die Zeiten des Alters hinübergenommen werden. Das Alter tritt ein, wenn die Leiblichkeit aufhört, vollkommenes Mittel des Geistes zu sein. Die Rezeptivität schwindet mehr und mehr und auch die Aktivität wird immer begrenzter. Trotzdem kann in dieser letzten Lebensperiode der sittliche Erwerb innerlich erhalten bleiben, auch wenn er seine volle Ausdrucksfähigkeit durch die Hemmungen des Leibes und die Beschränkung des Handelns verliert. Das alte wie das neue Testament zeichnen darum gerade auch hochbetagte Menschen als Besitzer und Vorbilder reifer Sittlichkeit.

Eine Unterscheidung und doch wieder eine gewisse Zusammenfassung der menschlichen Charaktere entsteht durch den Besitz von **Temperamenten,** die auch die sittliche Betätigung beeinflussen. Die Temperamente haben in der philosophischen Ethik — z. B. bei Kant — eine große Rolle gespielt. Sie wurden in früheren Zeiten wesentlich auf die verschiedene Mischung der Säfte des Menschen zurückgeführt. Aus dieser Auffassung sind auch die Bezeichnungen für die Haupttemperamente entstanden. Bei dem Sanguiniker sollte das Blut, bei dem Pflegmatiker der Schleim, bei dem Choleriker die gelbe Galle, bei dem Melancholiker die schwarze Galle die Grundlage bilden. Mag auch dieser physiologischen Betrachtungsweise eine gewisse Wahrheit zukommen, so sind doch die Temperamentunterschiede vor allem seelisch bedingt und dementsprechend zu definieren. Die Menschen nehmen in verschiedener Art die Eindrücke der Außenwelt auf und reagieren auf diese manigfaltig. Der eine Mensch nimmt rasch und freudig alle Reize auf, die ihm das Leben bringt. Aber dafür gehen sie nicht in die Tiefe, die Stimmung wechselt rasch und es kommt zu keiner dauernden und festen Aktivität. Das ist die Eigenart des **Sanguinikers.** Umgekehrt läßt der **Melancholiker** die Außenwelt möglichst wenig in sein Inneres eindringen und, wenn es geschieht, empfindet er mehr Schmerz als Lust. Sein Stimmungsleben ist ein viel konstanteres, aber fast immer ein schwermütiges. Zum Handeln entschließt er sich nicht leicht. Beim **Choleriker** dagegen ist das ganze Wesen auf ein zielbewußtes, erfolgreiches Handeln eingestellt. Er nimmt aus der Welt nur die Eindrücke auf, die er braucht, um in ihr wirken zu können. Fortwährende Betätigung schafft ihm ein inneres Wohlgefühl. Der **Pflegmatiker** sucht nicht nach Anläßen zum Handeln, sondern geht ihnen eher aus dem Weg. Kommt es aber einmal zum Wirken, dann verliert er weder die Besonnenheit noch die Stetigkeit. In der Wirklichkeit des Lebens kommen diese — hier nur ganz kurz skizzierten — Temperamentsunterschiede selten völlig rein vor. Aber bei den meisten Menschen läßt sich doch das Vorwiegen eines Temperamentes beobachten.

Alle Temperamente sind zunächst reine Naturbestimmtheiten und als solche Vorethisch. Keins ist besser als das andre, in jedem liegen Vorzüge und Gefahren. Alle Temperamente lassen eine ethisch negative Ausbildung zu, indem aus ihnen besondre Fehler, Leidenschaften oder Laster erwachsen können; in jedem liegt aber auch die Möglichkeit, in den Dienst ethischer Betätigung zu treten. **Das Ziel für den christlichen Charakter kann darum auch den Temperamenten gegenüber niemals Ausrottung und Unterdrückung sein, sondern vielmehr ihre Versittlichung, die sowohl eine Reinigung wie eine Ausbildung in sich schließt.** Das Ideal des Buddhisten, z. T. auch des alten griechischen Weisen ist die Temperamentslosigkeit; auch Mönch und Nonne sollen — besonders bei jesuitischer Seelenführung — möglichst temperamentlos sein. Die lutherische Reformation will dagegen das natürliche Temperament des Menschen im Christen erhalten. Dementsprechend hat auch der größte Maler der Reformation, Dürer, die vier Apostel, Paulus und Johannes, Markus und Petrus zugleich als die Vertreter der vier Temperamente dargestellt. Er knüpfte dabei an die Tatsache an, daß schon Jesus keineswegs temperamentlose Jünger suchte, sondern im Gegenteil — wie das bei Petrus besonders deutlich zum Ausdruck kam — ihr natürliches Temperament in den Dienst des Evangeliums und der Gemeindegründung stellte. Die Erzählungen von dem greisen Johannes über sein Zusammentreffen mit dem Ketzer Cerinth lassen noch deutlich den heiligen Zorn des Cholerikers und sein rasches Handeln erkennen. **So hat auch der einzelne christliche Charakter in seinem besonderen Temperament, einen Hinweis darauf, wie gerade er sich im natürlichen und religiösen Leben zu betätigen hat,** sei es mehr als aktive oder als rezeptive Persönlichkeit, sei es mehr durch ernste Zurückhaltung oder freudige Beweglichkeit.

Geben die Temperamente eine allgemeine Anweisung für die Betätigungsart, so hat der Mensch in dem ihm gegebenen **Talent** einen Wegweiser für die individuelle Form und Richtung seines Lebensberufes. Unter einem Talent verstehen wir eine angeborene, über das Durchschnittsmaß hinausgehende Befähigung in einer bestimmten Richtung oder auf einem besonderen Gebiet. So hat z. B. der einzelne Mensch eine besondere Begabung zur raschen Erlernung von Sprachen, der andre für technische Erfindungen. Wer sich auf den verschiedensten Gebieten in gleicher Weise leicht zu betätigen wüßte, wäre ohne bestimmtes Talent. **Der Wert eines Talentes besteht darin, daß es für den Einzelnen eine natürliche Hilfe ist auf die besondre Funktion, die er im Rahmen der menschlichen Gemeinschaft ausfüllen soll.** Das Talent bildet die schöpfungsmäßige Grundlage für die Wahl des sittlichen Lebensberufes. Dieser wird um so leichter und erfolgreicher durchgeführt werden, je mehr er

sich auf die Antriebe und Weisungen einer natürlichen Begabung stützen kann. **Auch der christliche Charakter wird ein vorhandenes Talent als Wegweiser benutzen, um die besondre Form zu finden, in der er sein Dienst gegenüber Gott und den Menschen zu vollziehen hat.** Auf der andern Seite kann die christliche Ethik in der Ausübung eines Talentes nicht die höchste Lebensaufgabe finden. Denn es ist möglich, daß äußere Verhältnisse, die letztlich auf Gottes Vorsehung und Regierung zurückgehen, die Ausnutzung einer bestimmten Begabung in einem ihr entsprechenden Beruf verhindern. Gerade in der Gegenwart sind viele Menschen genötigt, ihre äußere Existenz durch berufliche Leistungen zu fristen, die weder ihren Anlagen noch ihren Neigungen entsprechen. Nicht jedes künstlerische und wissenschaftliche Talent kann sich in einem künstlerischen und wissenschaftlichem Beruf ausleben. **In einem solchen Fall kann das Opfer des Talentes und seine Verwertung sittliche Pflicht werden.** Wie in manchen andern Fällen an sich wertvolle natürliche Gaben hingegeben werden müssen, so ist es möglich, daß der Einzelne in dieser Welt mit ihren Unvollkommenheiten und Irrationalitäten auf sein Talent verzichten muß.

Der christliche Charakter wird ein möglichst großes Maß der ihm vom Schöpfer geschenkten natürlichen Werte in sein neues Dasein hinübernehmen, sich aber bewußt bleiben, daß Pflege und Erhaltung seines neuen geistlichen Wesens noch höher stehen. Von ihr hat der folgende Artikel zu handeln.

Haben wir ein Bekenntnis unsers Glaubens nötig?

Dr. C. Schieler.

Man muß öfters während der schriftlichen und mündlichen Auseinandersetzungen über den Inhalt des Bekenntnisses die Frage hören, aufgeworfen meistens von jüngeren Theologen: Haben wir, hat die Kirche denn überhaupt ein Glaubensbekenntnis notwendig. Laß doch jeden glauben oder nicht glauben, was er glauben zu können meint. Wozu der Zwang, der doch nur ein Gewissenszwang ist? Dürfen wir uns nicht des hohen Gutes der evangelischen Freiheit erfreuen? So und noch anders lauten die Fragen und Einwürfe — in unsern Tagen! Glaubt man ja, daß die Kirche in unserm Jahrhundert des Lichtes, des Fortschrittes auf allen Gebieten des Lebens, der allgemein verbreiteten Bildung nicht mehr nötig habe, was man in früheren Zeiten nicht entbehren konnte, oder entbehren zu können meinte. Laßt uns darum dieser Frage einmal unsre ernste Aufmerksamkeit widmen und alles für und gegen objektiv erwägen.

P. Lange schreibt in seiner christlichen Dogmatik (II S. 638), diejenigen welche die gesetzliche Seite der Symbole (Glaubensbekenntnisse) leugneten, verwürfen damit die gesetzliche Seite der Kirche; „damit heben sie aber die Wirklichkeit der Kirche selbst auf, namentlich die Volkskirche, die Kindertaufe, die Konfirmation, die Ordnung des Kultus, die Bestimmtheit des Lehramtes und ähnliche Charakterzüge der Kirche, ja überhaupt das Verbindliche der kirchlichen Gemeinschaft." Was nun das Wort **Symbol** betrifft, so sei bemerkt, daß es allgemein ein Erkennungszeichen, dann im besonderen das Zeichen, an welchem die Zugehörigkeit zum Christentum oder auch zu einer besonderen christlichen Kirchengemeinschaft erkannt wird. Als Symbole im engeren Sinn gelten „Lehrformeln," in welchem die Christen sich zum Inhalt des Evangeliums bekennen. Ist es aber zu billigen, daß der Ausdruck Symbol auf Lehrformeln angewendet wird, welche den Inhalt des Evangeliums zusammenfassen sollen? Ganz gewiß! „Denn das Evangelium, welches sich allerdings mit keiner Formel deckt, aber auch nicht ohne jede Form überliefert, werden kann, bildet das ausschlaggebende Erkennungszeichen der Kirche Christi" (Müller Symb. §3). Die Annahme des Evangeliums oder das Bekenntnis zu Christo ist unerläßliches Kennzeichen einer christlichen Kirche. Man hat von einem **„undogmatischen Christentum"** geredet (vgl. O. Dreyer) und redet noch davon in gewissen Kreisen. Ein Christentum ohne Dogmen! Ohne Dogmen, die bindende Kraft haben sollen! Ein Christentum, wel-

ches dem Individuum freiläßt, zu glauben was es will. Oder man wollte ausgedehnte Formeln reduzieren. Aber werden diese Reduktionen nicht noch immer Dogmen enthalten, zu deren Inhalt man sich bekennen muß, wer als ein Christ gelten will? Ohne hier auf den Umfang des Bekenntnisses einzugehen, sei festgestellt, daß jede wirkliche Kirche ein Bekenntnis besitzt und wäre es auch nur die urapostolische Grundformel „Kyrios Jesous." Vgl. 1. Kor. 12, 3: „niemand kann Jesum einen Herrn heißen ohne durch den Heiligen Geist"; Apg. 12, 21: „wer den Namen des Herrn anrufen wird, soll selig werden" und Apg. 12, 36: „So wisse nun das ganze Haus Israel gewiß, daß Gott diesen Jesum, den ihr gekreuzigt habt, zu einem Herrn und Christ gemacht hat." Sehr tiefsinnig ist dem großen Apostel Jesus, der Gekreuzigte und Auferstandene der Herr. Sagt er doch klar und eindeutig Röm. 10, 9: „Denn so du mit deinem Mund bekennest Jesum, daß er der Herr sei und glaubest in deinem Herzen, daß ihn Gott von den Toten auferwecket hat, so wirst du selig." Jesus der Herr, die urapostolische Grundformel! „Die Ablegung dieses Bekenntnisses ist Symbol der Zugehörigkeit zu Christo und seiner Kirche." Doch ist zu beachten, was Jesus feierlichst erklärt hat (Matth. 7, 21): „Es werden nicht alle, die zu mir sagen: Herr, Herr! in das Himmelreich kommen, sondern die den Willen tun meines Vaters im Himmel."

Bestand aber eine **absolute** Notwendigkeit, dies urapostolische Bekenntnis zu erweitern? Eine solche Notwendigkeit läßt sich nicht behaupten. Dagegen ergibt sich eine **geschichtliche** Notwendigkeit. Es entstanden bald, noch zu Lebzeiten der Apostel, irrige Lehren. Ihnen gegenüber mußte die Kirche nicht bloß genauer beschreiben, was für einen Jesus sie verstehe und von ihren Gliedern verstanden haben wolle, sondern auch, in welcher Weise derselbe für einen Herrn und Christ zu halten sei, wenn man den Sinn der ersten Formel treffen will. Das ist der Weg, auf dem im Grund alle Symbole, alle Bekenntnisse, entstanden sind.

Jesus gab seiner Gemeine, seiner Kirche bestimmte Merkmale und verlangte von den Gliedern derselben, den Seinen, Anerkennung dieser Merkmale als Bedingung der Zugehörigkeit. Ebenso verfuhren die Apostel. Somit ist die Notwendigkeit eines Bekenntnisses für die Kirche Christi aus der Geschichte erwiesen. Und doch muß man den Ruf: „Fort mit den Bekenntnissen!" hören nicht bloß von außerhalb der Kirche, sondern auch aus ihrem Innern, aus dem Mund ihrer Diener. Diese **Antipathie** hat zuweilen die Form von Gleichgültigkeit. Man kümmert sich nicht um Bekenntnis; man kümmert sich viel um gute Sitte, um Politik und soziale Reformen. Zuweilen nimmt die Antipathie gegen Bekenntnisse die Form von **Feindseligkeit** an. Gibt es doch solche, welche in den

Bekenntnissen nur Steine des Anstoßes erblicken, Hindernisse des Fortschrittes, Quellen des Nachteils für die Kirche. Gegner der Bekenntnisse argumentieren oftmals so: Warum sollte man nicht eine Kirche auf der Basis des „guten Willens" organisieren. Leute, die guten Willen zeigen, brüderliche Gesinnung haben und üben, die versöhnlich, verträglich und strebsam zum Guten sind, sollten sich zu einer kirchlichen Gemeinschaft zusammenschließen ohne Rücksicht auf ihren Glauben und ohne Zwang, Bestimmtes zu glauben. Das wäre so etwas Aehnliches wie „Ethische Kultur" — aber keine Kirche. Wohin dies führt zeigt die „Ethische Kultur," welche jetzt rein atheistisch gerichtet ist und an „die Gesellschaft der Gottlosen," jene Ausgeburt der Hölle, sich angeschlossen hat. Und ist nicht das Gleiche der Fall mit all den größeren oder kleineren Gesellschaften, welche gegen ein bestimmtes Bekenntnis sich sträubten: diese freien, besser gesagt, sogenannten freien Gemeinden, weil sie doch keine wahre Freiheit kannten und übten? Die meisten sind Vereinigungen von Atheisten, Christusleugnern, die aber ethische Bestrebungen pflegen wollen. Das ist eine geschichtliche Erfahrung hinabreichend bis in unsre Tage: Eine Kirche muß ganz notwendig ein Bekenntnis haben und ich sage vorläufig auch das, daß eine jede christliche Kirche sich zu Christus dem Sohn Gottes, dem Herrn, bekennen und dies Bekenntnis von ihren Gliedern verlangen muß; daß eine evangelische Kirche sich zum Evangelium bekennen und dieses Bekenntnis zum Evangelium von ihren Gliedern, ganz besonders aber, in eminenten Sinn von ihren Dienern fordern muß. Sonst gibt sie sich selbst auf, duldet in ihrem Schoß Heuchler. Eine Kirche, welche Dauer haben soll, kann nicht auf Gefühl, auf guten Willen, aufgebaut sein. Die Geschichte beweist dies, und die Geschichte ist und bleibt die beste Lehrmeisterin. Alle die Gegner der Bekenntnisse sollten einmal sich ernstlich Zeit nehmen und Geschichte studieren, ehe sie gegen die Bekenntnisse auftreten. Und wenn sie dies nicht wollen, sollten sie ihre Augen öffnen und sehen, was in der Gegenwart rings um sie herum sich ereignet. — Die großen, starken Kirchen unsrer Tage haben ihre Bekenntnisse und diese Bekenntnisse, an denen sie festhalten, sind neben anderm gerade besonders die Quellen ihrer Kraft.

Da ist die **römisch-katholische Kirche.** Sie entfaltet Leben, Macht, Einfluß. Sie hat harte Zeiten der Verfolgung und Kämpfe von außen und von innen zu ertragen gehabt und gibt keine Zeichen von Schwäche, Niedergang, Absterben. Aber sie hat ihre Bekenntnisse, die drei sogenannten ökumenischen Bekenntnisse: das apostolische, nizäische und das athanasische und dann noch jenes, das bekannt ist unter dem Namen: „Canones und Dekrete des Konzils von Trient," in welchen direkt gegen die Lehren der Reformation

Stellung genommen, sie mit dem Anathem belegt und festgelegt ist, was der katholische Christ zu glauben hat. Mit „unfehlbarer" Gewißheit schließt ein jedes Dekret: wer das nicht glaubt, oder wer das leugnet, „anathema sit," der sei verflucht (andre übersetzen milder: der sei im Bann, oder sei ausgeschlossen — von der „alleinseligmachenden" Kirche). Eine der Quellen, der vornehmsten Quellen, der Kraft der katholischen Kirche ist die Klarheit, Bestimmtheit, mit welcher sie die Gegenstände des „Glaubens" ausspricht und in aller Welt proklamiert. Wir erinnern uns doch gewiß noch alle, wie ein früherer Papst seinen Feldzug gegen den Modernismus eröffnete, gegen jedes zeitgemäße Abweichen von der alten in den Bekenntnissen festgelegten Lehre. Die Welt staunte, spottete, aber die Kirche siegte.

Wenden wir unsern Blick von der katholischen Kirche zum **Protestantismus,** so machen wir die gleiche Entdeckung in unserm Land. Die Kirche des Protestantismus in den Vereinigten Staaten ist zerteilt in einige zwanzig Gruppen und diese Gruppen zerfallen wieder in 164 getrennte protestantische Denominationen. An der Spitze dieser langen Reihe von Kirchenkörpern stehen solche, welche lebenskräftig eine sehr große Zahl von Gliedern in sich vereinigen und große Tätigkeit entfalten, und sie alle haben Bekenntnisse, haben eine gewisse Summe von Glaubenswahrheiten, die sie verkünden, an denen sie festhalten mit Autorität und Bestimmtheit. Am Schluß dieser Reihe befinden sich eine Anzahl kleiner Denominationen, die geringe Lebenskraft beweisen und dies sind solch, welche Bekenntnissen keine Bedeutung beimessen, oder gar sich rühmen, daß sie überhaupt von Bekenntnissen nichts wissen wollen. Dies sind Tatsachen, Tatsachen die ein denkender Mensch, am wenigstens ein wissenschaftlich gebildeter Mensch übersehen darf. Eine Kirche, welche kein Bekenntnis hat, besitzt keine Lebenskraft, Geisteskämpfe, Zweifel, Anfechtung, wie sie die Zeit mit sich bringt, siegreich zu überstehen.

Es ist leicht, sagt Chas. Jefferson, Pastor von Broadway Tabernacle, New York, eine Kirche ohne irgendwelche Formen des Gottesdienstes zu organisieren, da es genug Leute gibt, welche der Meinung sind, daß diese nur ein Hindernis für eine Kirche bilden. Und so ist es auch leicht, eine Kirche ohne irgend ein Bekenntnis zu organisieren; viele Leute gehören keiner Kirche an und wollen nicht einer Kirche angehören, weil sie von Bekenntnissen überhaupt nichts wissen wollen, ihrer eignen Einsicht folgen und sich nicht binden lassen wollen. Tatsächlich hat es solche Kirchen schon gegeben und gibt es noch: Kirchen ohne Bekenntnis und ohne oder nur mit sehr bescheidenen Formen des Gottesdienstes. Hatten sie Bestand? Konnten sie die Stürme der Zeit überdauern? Hatten sie irgendeinen Einfluß auf das öffentliche Leben? Nicht einmal auf

das Privatleben ihrer Anhänger hatten sie bestimmenden Einfluß — sie hatten eben kein Bekenntnis.

Eine lebenskräftige Kirche zeigt **„erobernden" Einfluß, bekämpft den Zeitgeist mit all seinen üblen Erscheinungen, überwindet die Hindernisse,** die sich ihrer Tätigkeit entgegenstellen, gewinnt die **Zweifelnden und Gleichgültigen,** schweigt nicht still, wenn die Feinde Christi schmähen und höhnen. Aber sie kann dies alles nur, wenn sie ein bestimmtes bindendes Bekenntnis hat. Es ist nicht allzuschwer, eine scheinbar blühende Gemeinde zu haben, eine Anzahl Männer und Frauen, welche sich für Fragen der Religionsphilosophie interessieren und an Sonntagen einen „geistreichen, schön stilisierten" Vortrag anzuhören wünschen. Aber hat die Kirche nicht eine andre, höhere Aufgabe: **die Menschen zu Jesus zu bringen, sie zu bessern, sie zur Erkenntnis und Erfüllung ihrer Pflichten zu bewegen** —? Das Evangelium soll einem Sauerteig gleichen, das die ganze Masse durchdringt, verändert. Das kann eine Kirche nur dann sein, wenn sie ein festes Bekenntnis hat und daran festhält. Die Geschichte von 1900 Jahren beweist, daß, wo immer und wann immer eine Großtat getan werden mußte, dies geschah durch Männer, welche durch ein Bekenntnis stark geworden sind.

Jefferson sucht dies zu beweisen. Im fünften Jahrhundert entstand große Gefahr, daß die letzten Spuren römischer Zivilisation, auch die christliche Kirche, vernichtet würden durch die barbarischen Stämme, welche ihre nordischen Heimstätten verlassen hatten und sich gegen den Süden wandten. Und die einzige Macht, welche das Unheil abwendete, war jene Macht, welche die Männer besaßen und ausübten, welche an Gott, den allmächtigen Vater und an Jesum Christum, den Sohn Gottes glaubten. Aus diesem Glauben erwuchs ihnen die Kraft, jene Barbaren zu gesitteten Menschen heranzubilden, durch die Predigt des Evangeliums. Im siebenten und achten Jahrhundert drohte Europa eine furchtbare Gefahr durch die Heere Mohammeds, die aus dem Inneren Asiens hervorgebrochen und schon bis in das Herz der Christenheit vorgedrungen waren, überall den Halbmond, ihr Siegeszeichen, an die Stelle des Kreuzes aufpflanzend. Es entstand die Gefahr, daß Europa aufhören müsse, ein christlicher Kontinent zu sein und mohammedanisch zu werden. Und was wandte diese Gefahr ab? Wohl wurde durch die Schlacht von Tours (732) der Siegeslauf des Mohammedanismus abgebrochen, aber dieser Sieger des Christentums wurde errungen von Männern, die an Gott, den allmächtigen Vater und an Jesum Christum, seinen eingebornen Sohn glaubten. Die Diener Mohammeds verkündigten täglich: Es ist nur ein Gott, Allah, und Mohammed ist sein Prophet! — Die Diener Christi bekannten aber: Ich glaube an Gott den allmächtigen Vater und an Je-

sum Christum, seinen eingebornen Sohn. Dieses Bekenntnis ermutigte, begeisterte sie, errang schließlich den Sieg.

Die Lebenskraft einer Kirche äußert sich in dem Bestreben, **das Reich Gottes auf Erden auszubreiten,** also in der Pflege der Mission. Aber was kann jene tapferen Männer, jene beherzten Frauen, welche in die weitentfernten Länder Afrikas, Asiens und Australiens, nach China, Japan und Indien ziehen, um wilden, unzivilisierten Völkern das Evangelium zu bringen, was, frage ich, kann sie zu einem solchen Opferleben bestimmen, etwa Humanitätsgründe? Nein, diese hätten nicht die Kraft, zu dem Heroismus eines Missionarlebens zu bestimmen. Die richtige Antwort liegt darin, daß diese Männer und Frauen, alle, sich einem Bekenntnis unterworfen haben, ein Bekenntnis sich zum Lebensprinzip gemacht haben. Es ist das Bekenntnis der Kirche, die sie aussendet. Dies ist eine weitere Tatsache, die nicht übersehen werden darf. In einem Bekenntnis sagen wir nicht: „Ich meine," „ich nehme an," „ich vermute" oder „ich denke," sondern: **„ich glaube."** Und dies ist der Sieg, der die Welt überwindet, unser **Glaube an Jesus Christus, den Sohn des lebendigen Gottes.**

In unzähligen Menschen erwachen zuweilen, in dem Verlauf der Schicksale des Lebens und der Zeitereignisse, **Fragen, die sie sich selbst nicht beantworten können,** d. h. durch eignes Nachdenken oder Studium, Fragen, wie z. B. Gibt's einen Gott? Wie ist Gott beschaffen? Menschen geraten in einen Wirbel von Verwicklungen, aus welchem sie selber sich nicht befreien können und das Herz fragt: Gibt's einen Erlöser, einen Retter? Gibt's einen Tröster? Menschen suchen nach einem sicheren Weg durchs Leben und fragen: Gibt's eine Organisation, welcher eine Botschaft Gottes für die Menschen anvertraut ist? Gibt's einen Lehrer, welcher die Menschen den Weg durchs Leben zu Gott führen kann? Gibt's eine Vergebung der Sünden? Es kommt eine Zeit im Leben des Menschen, wo dies die wichtigste Frage ist, weil wir doch alle Sünder sind und weil, wenn wir meinen sollten, wir seien ohne Sünde, wir uns selber betrügen. Und dann noch die Frage, die doch zuweilen im Menschen ununterdrückbar erwacht: Gibt's noch ein Leben nach diesem Leben? Wir mögen diese Frage auch zurückzudrängen versuchen, sie erwacht wieder. Das Bekenntnis der Kirche gibt Antwort auf diese Fragen des menschlichen Herzens, eine klare, bestimmte Antwort. Darum hat die Kirche ein solches Bekenntnis notwendig.

Es ist eine auffallende, sehr erfreuliche Erscheinung, daß religiöse Fragen jetzt nach dem Weltkrieg immer weitere Kreise beschäftigt, Kreise, die vorher indifferent gegen solche Fragen sich verhielten. Bücher, religiösen Inhalts werden in größerer Anzahl gelesen; in

den Buchhandlungen findet man solche Bücher in großer Auswahl, wo man es nicht erwarten sollte. Die ewigen Fragen nach Gott, Erlösung, Sündenvergebung, Leben nach dem Tod beschäftigen die Herzen der Menschen in diesen ernsten Zeitlagen; und wenn die Not den einzelnen trifft oder in das stille, glückliche Familienleben einbricht. Die Kirche hat die Pflicht, auf die Frage des menschlichen Herzens Antwort zu geben. Sie darf sich nicht begnügen mit Ermahnungen, Ermunterungen, schönen Worten, moralischen Reflexionen. Und in ihrem Bekenntnis gibt sie die Antworten. Sie hat in ihrem Besitz das Evangelium Jesu Christi und dies enthält die Antwort auf all die Fragen des unruhigen Menschenherzens; es zeigt den gütigen, barmherzigen Vater im Himmel, der seine Kinder liebt und nicht will den Tod des Sünders, zeigt den Erlöser, der aus Liebe zu den Menschenkindern vom Himmel herniedergestiegen, den Menschen Versöhnung, Entsündigung, Gnade und Heil zu bringen; zeigt den Tröster, den Heiligen Geist, der uns in alle Wahrheit einführen kann und will, zeigt die große, weltumfassende Heilsanstalt, die Kirche Jesu; lehrt uns das Leben nach dem Tod, überhaupt alles, wonach das fragende Menschenherz verlangt. Ein Theologe, Philipp Schaff, der gewiß in unsern Kreisen noch wohl bekannt sein dürfte, hat in einem Werk die „Bekenntnisse der Christenheit" zusammengestellt, in fleißiger sorgfältiger Arbeit. Der Einblick in dieses Werk belehrt uns, welche Anstrengungen die Kirche im Lauf der Jahrhunderte gemacht hat, um all die Fragen zu beantworten, welche das Herz aus den Nöten der Zeit und des menschlichen Lebens heraus bewegt haben. **Eine Kirche, die ihre Aufgabe erfüllen will, muß ein Bekenntnis haben.**

EDITORIALS

PRECIOUS MOMENTS

The other day we read in the "Living Church" (Organ of the Anglo-Catholics in the Episcopal Church) an article on "Why one should go to Mass every Sunday." Regularity, the writer said, was a good thing in all activities of life. By it good habits are built up and the habit of regular church attendance is a good one for various reasons. What is Sunday without an hour in God's house? Where can a worshipful mood be better induced and cultivated than in the sanctuary? What is more natural than for people of the same faith to join in mutual fellowship? With all this we found ourselves in hearty agreement. But then all at once we came to the parting of the ways. We were told that so far the writer had not mentioned the chief reason for going to church every Sunday. Had he not said going to *mass;* not simply, to church? Yes, he continued, it is a good thing to hear a sermon every Sunday. Still, while the sermon is the main thing in the service to the Protestant, for us the climax of the service is the *Mass* for it is the offering up of the sacrifice of Christ on the cross. We were shocked when we read this. According to this author the Mass is then, just as it is to the Roman Catholic, an "unbloody repetition of the bloody sacrifice on Calvary." Those acquainted with the Heidelberg Catechism will recall the strong words it hurls at such "a rejection of the only sacrifice" brought once for all. We may not become so vehement in our epithets as the catechism, but it certainly seems as though the Romanizing of the Anglo-Catholics couldn't very well become more complete. However, what interests us in the Anglo-Catholic's remarks just now, is the statement that to the Protestant the sermon is the main part of the Sunday service.

There is noticeable now a tendency to enrich the worship element in our Protestant services. A good deal has already been accomplished along these lines and it would be very natural if some advocates of liturgical reform went to extremes. The high evaluation of the sermon would, nevertheless, be accepted by nearly all. We may have a very modest conception of our own sermonizing abilities, who, though, would deny that a good, strong, well worked out and well delivered sermon forms the most substantial attraction of the service?

To preach such a sermon is no light or easy matter, and any help or suggestion that might facilitate our task ought to be welcome. It is admittedly a laborious undertaking to find a text, or two, every Sunday, or a subject first and then a text to fit it; or after finding a subject, how to develop it. Here now comes the suggestion we want to offer—knowing well that we have made it more than once this year—here comes the idea we had in mind when we wrote that title, "Precious Moments." A minister's mind is by no means always equally active and productive. In the whirl of a busy life, in attending to the many tasks of the daily routine, moods and moments of inspiration are by no means frequent. All the more, therefore, should they be grasped by the forelocks when they come, suddenly, unexpectedly. To the writer they come most readily when bent over a good book, in the morning hour. At times they arrive, without such an outward vehicle, emerging from somewhere below the field of consciousness.

But they are always greeted with joy, for they bring a heightening of the mental life. They uncover territory we had not known to be there. They lend wings to the soul so that sometimes we think we are not such poor actors after all.

Such moments ought to be utilized to the fullest extent. A minister ought always to carry paper and pencil with him and note down at once text and subject or idea or whatever of mental stimulus has come into consciousness; for it is by no means certain that all of the inspiration of the moment can be safeguarded hours or days after they have come. Then one ought to have at home a larger sheet ready at hand, containing a number of subjects that one has under treatment, and to which one adds from time to time the accumulations of new insights and pertinent ideas and illustrations one's thought and reading furnish him.

In this way one will soon find the sermonizing work considerably simplified. One will even, as Dr. Calkins promised (see B. R. Nov. '31) often have the experience of an almost embarrassing fulness, and one's people will find that their minister is leading them at times through a pasture land as fresh and green as only the Great Shepherd could have shown him.

LIKE PRIEST, LIKE PEOPLE

We don't know who first coined the above phrase. It seems to date back to Catholic, perhaps pre-Reformation times for it is seldom that a Protestant would choose the term "priest" as the distinctive title of a minister. But the idea expressed in the saying is a challenging one and although it needs very decided qualifications there is enough truth in it to cause us to consider it very

seriously. One might even say that the saying applies more to the Protestant minister and his congregation than to the Catholic priest. With the Protestant minister the matter of personality is of greater consequence than with his Catholic step-brother. If his personality is not such as to influence his people, his office, his ministerial standing will help him little. On the other hand, it is not the personal element that is decisive in the priest's case. Naturally the Catholic layman would rather have a good priest of forceful character and pleasant disposition; but his character as a priest, behind whom there is the authority of the church, its hierarchy and the pope, in the last analysis, it is this that assures him of the unquestioning loyalty and obedience of his people. We see very ordinary Catholic priests ministering to large audiences for many years or carrying out enormous building plans successfully, simply because centuries of religious training of their people and the organized leadership of their superiors are back of them.

In our Protestant denominations, those ministers will have the best chance of making a permanent impression on their people whose churches make the least concession to the modern spirit. Although we ourselves and our Synod do not belong in that class, we cannot help seeing that most people are still "fundamentalist". The church bodies which indoctrinate their members in the faith "once delivered to the saints" show the most vigorous growth. We have repeatedly referred to the case of the Lutherans in this country. Their annual increase is greater than any other church's, and the Missourians, the most exclusive and uncompromising of all Lutherans, stand at the top. We do not think that the members of these bodies are all as narrow as most of their ministers, but their churches are all cast in the same mental mould. Every one feels that the "Lutherans" are in a class of their own: an indication that the ministers have been successful dogmatists.

In our Church the minister can't follow this method, and very few do. He has two ways of influencing his people, his preaching and his personality. We have had many great preachers. Hartmann, of Chicago, was one. Adolf Baltzer was another; he combined in himself the advantages of a strong personality with those of an earnest and impressive speaker. His son, in his best days, showed the gifts of his father to a marked degree. We have a few very strong speakers today, whom their modesty forbids us to mention. Some of our older men have exerted considerable influence in their spheres, e. g., father K. Haass, of Detroit, who in 1871 brought his own church body, the Synod of the Northwest, into affiliation with the Synod of the West (our own former name). His particular strength must have been the ready appeal of a large-hearted personality. Our older pastors were of a distinctly pietistic

bent. They stressed conversion, they preached a living faith that results in a Christian character. There is still one left of the old school, who by preaching and example has endeared himself to many, but our younger ministers have shed the pietistic heritage. Some are strong on the social gospel, here and there too strong. However, in order to impress himself and his message in such a way on his congregation as to leave lasting traces, a man needs a ministry of many years and our preachers don't last long enough in one field, as a rule.

We see that the rule expressed in our theme is, in real life, subject to great qualifications. It has its truth, but only in unusually strong personalities does it come to full realization, and then only in cases of long pastorates. Even in the latter case and when finally a change comes, the adjustment required in pastor and congregation may seriously threaten valuable traditions, traditions it took long years to build up.

One comes to the conclusion that the phrase may also be reversed and be equally true: "Like people, like priest."

Every man is dependent on his environment. In a once very famous book of a scientist the statement was even made that life *is* the power of adjustment to changes in the environment. That was doubtless going too far, but the influence of the environment is a factor of tremendous weight. Put a minister in a church that is spiritually dead or, in a worldly sense, very much alive, and how long will it last until he sinks down under the juniper tree, yielding to the continual pressure from without and finding that his power is gone from him. How seductive is the desire for popularity, and when popularity comes how soon will the favor of the people mean more to us than loyalty to principles and courageous manhood.

In Dr. Braun's book "The Conversion of the Minister and Its Influence on his Ministry," we read the story of a live congregation in Westphalia, that had a rationalist pastor for forty years and kept its spirituality alive, nevertheless, by reading Brastberger's sermons on Sunday afternoons. When the old man died and a new voice preached the old gospel with power, the congregation revived and soon bloomed again like the valley of Sharon. That was a remarkable case of a congregation keeping its spiritual health under a rationalist pulpit. A very unusual case, too.

But what minister, working for long in a stony field and in an empty church, could keep his head up, his soul young and his faith in humanity unbroken? Even in cases not so desperate, after a limited number of years, he generally finds that his usefulness is on the wane. If he is young he will soon find another place. If old, the matter is more serious, but if he is not too choicy, some-

thing may turn up sooner or later. At any rate, one must not carry one's faith that the minister can mold the congregation, too far. We are not all spiritual giants nor Old Testament prophets. When the signs multiply that a change is desirable bid the people good-bye with as good a grace as possible and make for the *open spaces.*

"THE CHURCH HAS GOT TO PROVE ITSELF BY ITS FRUITS, NOT BY ITS ROOTS"

This striking statement we found the other day in a religious weekly (The Christian Leader). The writer was referring to the revolutionary movements against religion witnessed in several countries. Millions of men today have not only lost their religion but are engaged in a systematic campaign of anti-religious education whose purpose is to make the youth of the land immune to any religious appeal. In our own country, he says, this tendency has not reached the stage of violent onslaught as yet, but there is unquestionably a quiet determination on the part of great numbers of people to utterly ignore both religion and the church. We cannot meet this situation simply by invoking the authority of the bible, by repeating the formulas of ancient creeds or by dwelling on the glories of the past. At the basis of this social unrest we shall find one fundamental factor, namely, the demand that human life be made richer, that human personality be more firmly secured and that some of the glaring evils of the social order be eliminated. Unless religion and the church become creative instruments, helping men to achieve this new life, they will die. If, on the other hand, they seek to bring meaning and significance into chaos and help to establish upon the earth a new civilization which we can call the Kingdom of God, they will have an access of strength and will become more firmly entrenched than ever before.

With these sentiments a growing number of church members and leaders will be in hearty agreement although we would certainly hesitate to treat this new civilization and the Kingdom of God as one and the same thing. The new discovery of the Social Gospel, which has come to our generation, has put a heavy, sometimes a onesided, emphasis on the ethical out-working of the Christian faith. But the merest beginner in Christianity is aware of the fact that Christ is not to be blamed if his church has sometimes stressed the roots of the faith more than the fruits. Stanley Jones has recently brought this out again in his book on the Christ of the Mount (which we discuss in this number, page 69). He says if Christianity is powerless in ethical reconstruction, its redemptive activity is futile. Christ had much to say about the

power of faith, but in his majestic picture of the day of judgment he tells us that a life of love is the standard which decides the fate of men, not what they believe. And Paul, the man who formulated the gospel of the justification by faith, is nevertheless equally emphatic in saying that God will render to everyone according to what he has done. The apostle James seems to disagree with Paul and his justification theory, and has seriously perturbed many, otherwise enlightened Christians. Still he is absolutely in accord with his Master when he claims that the doer only is in the Kingdom, the mere hearer is practising self-deception.

It is true that in the history of the church there have been periods when the mental acceptance of creeds has seemed sufficient to call a man a Christian. This fact does not prove that creeds are useless, for it is an ancient and true maxim which the Latins expressed when they said, "Abusus non tollit usum". Still we have to guard very carefully against an easy way of appropriating to ourselves the "merits" of Christ. In the imperfection of life one is apt to fall back on the comforting fact that Christ died for our sins and that therefore everything is well as long as we cling to that faith. One should not forget that it also says that no one can see God without holiness. It would be fatal to forget that the roots of our Christian life are in the redemption by Christ Jesus which faith opens to us. But if there are leaves only, no fruits, are we not an encumbrance of the land?

The church at large is out in the world, critical eyes are upon her, great problems are to be solved. She cannot refuse her cooperation. If she is to be a leaven to permeate the life of humanity, she cannot withhold herself from any of the burdens that are lying on all, but mostly on the weak. The prophets and Christ himself have shown her how to render service in the cause of the Kingdom. The task is more complicated than in the time of our fathers. How sorely do we need men of light and leading. In the meantime, everyone is to lend a hand. Trade with the one pound you have received. Faithfulness of the many is just as much needed as leadership of the few.

Eine Krücke für die Lahmen?

Vor Jahren, als ich an unsrer Gemeinde zu Springfield (Mo.) stand, hatte ich eines Sonntagsnachmittags eine Unterredung mit einem unkirchlichen Mann. Ich suchte ihn religiös zu beeinflussen, indem ich auf den Trost hinwies, welchen der christliche Glaube in den Anfechtungen des Lebens gewährt. Ist es nicht, so fragte ich, ein Zeugnis für die Wahrheit der Religion, daß in schweren Schicksalsschlägen und besonders angesichts des Todes so viele Menschen

sich zu Gott wenden, die früher nichts von ihm wissen wollten? Zu meiner großen Ueberraschung schlug mein Argument fehl. Gerade daß der Mensch erst in Not oder im Alter sich auf die Religion besinnt, war ihm ein Zeichen, daß für den gesunden, normalen Menschen sie überflüssig sei. Sie sei ein Angstprodukt, das sich der durch herbe Erfahrungen oder den Zusammenbruch seiner physischen Kräfte zermürbte Geist des Menschen gemacht habe.

Es erinnerte mich an ein Gespräch, das zwischen H. W. Beecher und Ingersoll (man sprach damals noch viel von Ingersoll) stattgefunden haben sollte. Ingersoll hatte behauptet, die Religion sei für den gesunden und gebildeten Menschen unnötig, sie sei nur eine Krücke für den Lahmen. Der erleuchtete Mensch des 19. Jahrhunderts könne auf seinen eigenen Füßen stehen. Ja, soll darauf Beecher geantwortet haben, aber was würden Sie von dem Mann denken, der einen Lahmen an Krücken gehen sähe und ihm dieselben unter die Armen wegstieße mit dem Bemerken: Warum gehst du nicht auf deinen eigenen Beinen?

Beecher — wenn seine Erwiderung zutreffend gewesen sein sollte — muß haben andeuten wollen, daß in wichtiger Beziehung alle Menschen nicht so sehr fest auf den Füßen seien und daher wohl einer Stütze bedürften. Jedoch der Einwand der Unkirchlichen und Ungläubigen gegen die Religion basiert zum großen Teil auf dem Gedanken, daß die Religion wesentlich eine Vorbereitung für das Jenseits sei und ihren Gläubigen eine Garantie für ein seliges Leben nach dem Tod biete. Darum nennte sie auch der Obengenannte (von Springfield) ein Angstprodukt. Die Furcht vor Tod und Verdammnis schaffe einen fruchtbaren Boden für das Evangelium von dem Sünderfreund und Todesüberwinder.

Es ist eine alte Beobachtung, daß schlechte Zeiten — mit einem Wort — Not, beten lehrt, und daß, die hier wenig haben, nach dem Geistlichen mehr verlangen als die viel haben. Kardinal O'Connell von Boston hat kürzlich gesagt, er pflegte zu denken, es sei eine schöne Sache, die äußere Lage der armen Katholiken zu bessern. Aber es wäre ein Irrtum gewesen: Je wohlhabender und gemächlicher sie würden, desto mehr kämen sie von der Kirche ab. Daraus — und aus Aehnlichem — schließt der Psychologe Walter B. Pitkin, daß, wenn eine natürliche, gesunde Lebensweise möglich werde, Religion eine überflüssige Sache sei. (See his „Psychology of Happiness.")

Das ist aber ein Fehlschluß. Der Mensch ist von Natur träge. Wenn ihn die Notwendigkeit nicht zu täglicher Arbeit zwänge, so lebte er im süßen Nichtstun dahin. Ist das ein Beweis dafür, daß das „Dolce far niente" seine natürliche Bestimmung ist? Oder, wenn er nicht den Sporn der Ideale empfände, so würde er sich

nie über das Niveau der Triebe erheben. Ist darum das Trieb-leben die eigentliche Heimat des Menschen?

Heutzutage, wo das überweltliche Gebiet des Glaubens so vielen zweifelhaft oder gleichgültig geworden ist, gilt es, noch mehr als früher, das Gewicht auf die Wirkung des Glaubens in **diesem** Leben zu legen, auf seine Bedeutung für den Aufbau eines christlichen Charakters und auf das, was die Religion bieten kann für die Neuordnung des gesellschaftlichen Lebens. Schon der Apostel Paulus hat uns hier den Weg gezeigt. Er schreibt in dem Brief an den Timotheus: Die Gottseligkeit ist zu allen Dingen nütze. Sie hat die Verheißung dieses und des zukünftigen Lebens. Wer die Religion verschmäht, stößt nicht nur den Freund in der Not von sich, sondern auch den Führer durch alle Wirrnisse des Lebens.

Der Konfirmandenunterricht.

Unsre Pastoren befinden sich augenblicklich mitten in der Arbeit an ihren Konfirmandenklassen. Was können, was sollten wir erreichen mit den Knaben und Mädchen, die wir um uns gesammelt haben? Was sind die Ziele, denen wir mit ihnen zustreben? Solche Fragen legt sich der gewissenhafte Geistliche augenblicklich mit mehr Ernst als gewöhnlich vor. Da war es uns höchst willkommen, als von Herrn Professor Katterjohn das Anerbieten kam, uns einen Artikel (englisch) über „Die Ziele des Konfirmandenunterrichts" zu liefern. Wir ahnten damals nicht, daß der Tod uns diesen geschätzten Mann entreißen würde, ehe er seinen Plan ausführen konnte. Pastor O. W. Wagner übernahm es, an seine Stelle zu treten. Seine Arbeit liegt uns vor in dieser Nummer; aber während wir dies schreiben, wissen wir noch nicht, was sie enthält, und es mag uns erlaubt sein, selbst einige Worte zu dem Thema zu sagen.

Es ist natürlich, in die Vergangenheit zu schauen und sich zu fragen: Was waren Unterricht und Konfirmation mir? Schreiber dieses war 15 Jahre alt, als er in den Unterricht eintrat. Sein Pastor war ein hervorragender Mann. Mit Weisheit und Ernst suchte er seine Schüler zum persönlichen Glauben zu führen. Mit vielen gelang ihm dies. Schreiber dieses hat sich nie den himmlischen Realitäten so nahe gefühlt als zu jener Zeit. Er empfand damals den „Stoß zu einer ewigen Bewegung," von dem Tholuck so beweglich zu reden verstand. Es ging durch viele Schwankungen, aber jene sechs Monate sind ihm ein unverlierbarer Schatz gewesen.

Naturgemäß versuchte er, als er selber Lehrer geworden war, seine Schüler auch zum Verständnis eines persönlichen Christentums zu führen. Bald jedoch wurde es ihm klar, daß in den meisten

Fällen sein Bemühen ein frommer Wunsch bleiben würde. Die Knaben und Mädchen schienen nicht sehr geistlich gesinnt; auch waren die meisten erst 13 (einige noch weniger) Jahre alt, so daß man von ihnen kaum die innere Reife für religiöse Entschließungen erwarten konnte.

Dennoch scheint uns die Hauptaufgabe die zu sein, in den Kindern das Verständnis zu wecken, daß das Christentum eine Sache des Herzens und Lebens ist. Wenn man ihnen dies nahe bringt, daß sie im Gebet Gott suchen und auf seinen Wegen zu wandeln trachten, so ist viel erreicht. Es ist nicht ohne Grund, daß im Katechismus dem Gebet ein ganzes Hauptstück gewidmet wird; noch auch, daß das erste Hauptstück zeigt, wie man wandeln solle und dann im zweiten und in Christo die Kraftquelle aufgedeckt wird.

Im übrigen halten wir von dem Auswendiglernen der Katechismusfragen wenig oder gar nichts, dagegen vom Bekanntsein mit den biblischen Geschichten und den großen Männern der Kirche sehr viel. Es gibt viele Pastoren, die auf das Memorieren des Gedächtnisstoffes viel Wert legen und viel Zeit damit verlieren. Es ist auch schön und wertvoll, eine Anzahl von wohlausgewählten Bibelsprüchen zu wissen. Aber für den inneren Menschen kommt beim Memorieren wenig heraus. Ja, im Gegenteil, der Schüler bekommt leicht den Eindruck, daß der Gedächtniskram die Hauptsache sei. Nein, die Hauptsache ist das innere Anfassen. Was sie auswendig gelernt haben, vergessen sie sechs Wochen nach der Konfirmation. Wenn aber die Persönlichkeit des Pastors oder der lebendige Stoff selbst ihr inneres Leben beeinflußt hat, so mag ihnen ein Dienst geleistet sein, der lebenslängliche Bedeutung hat.

Wenn der Pastor mit seinen Konfirmanden auf diesem Gebiet und in diesem Sinn Erfolg hat, so kann er sich glücklich preisen, und andre werden ihn noch in späteren Jahren im guten Andenken behalten. Die Sache hat ihre große Schwierigkeiten, doch ist sie nicht unmöglich. Was man auch vom Konfirmandenunterricht und seinen Mängeln denke, in ihm haben wir ein großes Gut, und wir sollten seine Möglichkeiten aufs treuste und entschiedenste entwickeln.

The Christian World

One By One

The news comes to us that the Reverend Thomas B. Campbell, one time Cowley Father, and Assistant Rector of Mount Calvary Church, of Baltimore, has taken the inevitable step of those who seriously play with Roman ideas and has entered the fold of the Church of Rome. Following so closely upon the submission of Dr. Delany and coupled with the fact that several of the Anglo-Catholic group have recently gone over to the Roman Catholic Church, this latest passing on of a member of the Romish group in our church should give the Anglo-Catholics food for thought. Unless this is precisely what the Anglo-Catholics have in mind, certainly this division of our communion is receiving the most obvious, lefthanded advertising it could get.

In a way one ought to respect these men who make their submission to Rome. They at least have the courage of their convictions. In that respect they differ distinctly from those who linger in our church and covertly, by indirect means, attempt to subvert our worship. At the same time it is a pathetic illustration that if one plays with fire one is bound to be burned, and the burn one receives from flirting with Roman Catholic beliefs is of the sort to leave an indelible mark upon one's mind.

Unless the Anglo-Catholics really propose to use their organization with the purpose of training men for the Roman priesthood the altogether frequent defections of their number to the Roman Church should lead them to some serious thinking.—*The Chronicle.*

The Historic Episcopate

By Dr. Friedrich Heiler

Professor of Theology at the University of Marburg
and President of the German High Church Union

Translated from the German by George Liebig,
Lincensed Lay Reader at St. George's Church, Berlin

Introduction

"We are 'born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.' Our Lord Jesus Christ gave His Spirit to His Apostles; they again laid their hands on those who were to succeed them; and thus the sacred gift has been transmitted to our present bishops, who have ordained us as their co-workers and, in a certain sense, as their deputies." With these words Newman prefaced

the first of the celebrated *Tracts for the Times*, which gave the starting impulse to the Oxford Movement. (Compare also Tract 4: *Adherence to the Apostolic Succession the Safest Course;* No. 7: *The Episcopal Church Apostolic*, etc.)

The appeal to Apostolic Succession constitutes the starting point of the Catholic Movement in the Anglican Church; consequently we need not be surprised that Apostolic Succession became the Alpha and Omega of all Anglo-Catholicism, that, as a matter of fact, it today constitutes the point upon which all Anglican attempts at reunion with the Protestant Free Churches turn. No wonder that in the German High Church Movement also, which has taken over from Anglicanism not only its name,[1] but has also received from the latter powerful spiritual impulses, the call for Apostolic Succession made itself heard, and that many of its advocates strenuously endeavored to regain, in some form or other, the episcopal succession lacking in our National Church. For a number of our friends the absence of this succession, and the repudiation of our Church's orders by the Orthodox, Roman, and Anglican Churches became a matter of constant spiritual unrest.

The opposite to this vociferous call for "valid orders," for admission into the great line of "succession," is an absolute lack of appreciation, nay more, a deep aversion against Apostolic Succession on the part of ordinary every-day Protestantism. The "succession" of the ministry, transmitted by episcopal laying on of hands, appears to most Protestants as the culminating point of a mechanical-magical view of Christianity, and the Church, as the negation of the Spirit in favor of an empty "fiction" and a magical ceremony.[2]

Here, as in many other ecclesiastical questions, we find two extremes confronting and opposed to each other: Over-estimation of an external institution, elevated to the position of a criterion of true ecclesiasticism and Christianity, and under-estimation of such an institution, the deep symbolic value of which is entirely misunderstood. The best pabulum for both extreme views is to see what history has to say, a glance at the great and intricate history of the Christian ministry, and, of views and interpretation of same,[3] helps us to correct certain distorted views, which have crept in by stealth, both in Anglicanism and in Protestantism, and enables us to arrive at a general and impartial, as distinguished from one-sided, consideration of the question.

---

[1] That was not a particularly happy move. The etymological interpretation: "High Church—thinking highly of the Church" is an afterthought and artificial. Originally "High Church" is a self-conscious party name, which laid down the essential difference between the movement stressing the Ordained Ministry, and the evangelical Low Church and the liberal-rationalistic Broad Church respectively. It is a pity that the High Church Movement did not adopt the term "Evangelical-Catholic," which at the inception of the movement in Germany had not previously been claimed by others. Today, after twelve years' development, such a change of name is not such an easy matter.

[2] Compare: van der Goltz: *The Episcopal Question, Religion in History and Today,* 12, 1134: "The introduction of a special form of ordination, to say nothing of the fiction of Apostolic Succession, would in principle be opposed to the evangelical conception of the Ministry. Such conception is, however, also repudiated by all friends of episcopacy."

[3] The most thorough research into the historical aspect of the question is that conducted by Anglican theologians—Edwin Hatch: *The Organization*

I.

According to conventional general ideas "Apostolic Succession," being interpreted, means that the Apostles by the laying on of hands appointed bishops, and so transmitted their full apostolic powers to them; that the latter in their turn appointed other bishops, and passed on the sacramental and judicial powers, so that there exists to this day an unbroken chain of episcopal laying on of hands from the Apostles down to the bishops of today. That there is a chain of imposition of hands starting from the very earliest times is a matter about which there cannot be any doubt whatever; because appointment to the sacred ministry was from the very beginning effected by the laying on of hands, as we learn from the New Testament (Acts 13: 3; 1 Timothy 4: 14; 5: 22; II Timothy 1: 6). What is, however, highly improbable, historically, as regards the early days of the Church, is the perpetuation of the priestly and pastoral office by the laying on of hands by *bishops* in the later, more modern, sense of the word. Both in the New Testament and in the writings of several apostolic Fathers and early Church writers (Clement of Rome, Polycarpus, Irenæus) the office of Bishop and Elder are not yet clearly distingushed from each other. The term "Overseer" *(episkopoi)*, "Principle" *(proistàmenoi)*, "Elder" (*presbyteroi*) are repeatedly used as synonyma for a common office, which from the beginning is clearly distinguished from the subordinate office of "deacon." It is not improbable that originally the term "Elder" signified more the preëminence and the dignity, the term "Bishop" more the official direction or management of the community and the divine services. At the head of the various Christian communities there were, in the first place, a majority of such "presbyterial bishops," upon whom—especially in the absence of prophets and pneumatologists—the regular preaching of the Gospel and the regular presidency at celebrations of the Eucharists devolved.

Out of this *collegiate* episcopal office was evolved—in some communities sooner than in others—a monarchic episcopate. We find the first clear confirmation of the existence of an independent bishop, superior in rank to the Council of Presbyters, in the writings of Ignatius of Antioch, to whom the bishop is Christ's vicar pure and simple. The development of this real and full episcopate, and with it the tripartition of the ministry (diaconate, presbyterate, episcopate), took place, although not everywhere with equal speed, throughout the

---

of the Early Church, 1881; C. H. Gore (formerly Bishop of Oxford): *The Church and the Ministry,* new edition 1919; *Essays on the Early History of the Church and the Ministry,* ed. H. B. Swete, London, 1921; including especially C. H. Turner: *Apostolic Succession, 93ff.* W. H. Frere (now Bishop of Truro): *Early Forms of Ordination, 263ff;* A. C. Headlam (now Bishop of Gloucester): *The Doctrine of the Church and Reunion,* London, 1920, *124ff.* H. B. Streeter: *The Primitive Church,* studied with special reference to the Origin of the Christian Ministry, London, 1929.

From the Roman Catholic point of view—P. Batiffol: La hiérarchie primitive, in "Etudes d'histoire et de théologie positive," I, Paris, 1906, *223ff; L'Eglise naissante et le Catholicisme,* I, Paris, 1922, especially *196ff;* P. Schanz: *Apology of Christianity,* III, 1906, *144ff.* Additional literature in: "Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique, I, 1923.

From the Protestant point of view—A. Harnack: *Dogmatic History,* I, 1909, *400ff; Origin and Development of the Constitution of the Church and of Canon Law During the First Two Centuries,* 1910; Karl Müller: *History of the Church,* I, 1929.

whole Christian Church in the East and in the West, so that it must be regarded as an ecumenical uniform department.

In the middle of the second century this development appears to have been practically complete. Nevertheless, the older presbyterial and collegiate system still left many deep marks of its methods behind during the following centuries, both in practice and in theory. The relatively late *Canones Hyppoliti* contain a uniform form of prayer both for the ordination of presbyters and the consecration of bishops. In Alexandria, the foundation of the Evangelist St. Mark, the custom of inducting the bishop to his office, not by the imposition of hands of other bishops, but of those of the presbytery of twelve members, appears to have been preserved right up to the Council of Nicæa.[4] And even the most learned of all the old Fathers of the Church, St. Jerome, at the beginning of the fourth century emphatically advocated the view, that the office of presbyter and bishop were identical *(idem est presbyter qui et episcopus)*. The monarchic episcopate was based, he says, not upon divine institution, but upon ecclesiastical custom. The Christian communities were formerly governed by a Council of Presbyters, and the election of one presbyter to the position of president of the whole council was merely a matter of "*in schismatis remedium*" (for the prevention of divisions—schisms—in the community). The original undivided "oneness" of presbyterate and episcopate was evidenced to the fact that in the Primitive Church, as also to this day in the Eastern Church (as distinguished from the Roman view), not only the bishops but also the ordinary priests are regarded as "successors" of the Apostles.

Even after a monarchic episcopate had been evolved, the idea of Apostolic Succession in this office, to say nothing of transmission of apostolic plenary powers by episcopal laying on of hands, remained latent. It was not until the end of the second century that, in the struggle against the Gnostics, the unbroken chain of succession of bishops were brought forward as a proof of the truth and purity of the ecclesiastical tradition. In opposition to the Gnostic heretics who for their "superior" esoteric wisdom laid claim to a secret transmission alleged to have been handed down from the Apostles he advocates of the ecclesiastical tradition, especially Irenæus and Tertullian, relied upon the absolute *provable* succession *(diadoché, successio)* of the well known presbyters and bishops, which goes back to the Apostles, the founders of the ecclesiastical Metropoles.[5] This ostensible professed succession appeared to them to be a guarantee for the inviolate perpetuation of the Church's faith; by means of this succession, so they believed, it was not difficult to demonstrate and keep track of the clear apostolic tradition. In the "succession of the Ministry" the presbyters and bishops possessed "the certain charism of the Truth" (Iranæus);

---

[4] Jerome, Ep. 146, Mi. P. L. 22, 1192*ff*; other references in P. Batiffol; "Etudes d'histoire et de théologie positive," Paris, 1906, I, 272*ff*.

[5] The expression "diadéchesthai" is used for the first time about the year 97 A. D. by Clemens Romanus (*Ad Corint* 44) for succession in office. Regular emphasis upon the chain of the *"diadoch "* is for the first time laid in 175 A. D. in the "Hypomnémata" of Hegesippus (in Eusebius H. E. II, 23, 4; IV, 22, 3.

in their unbroken succession they were "the propagators of the Apostolic Seed" (Tertullian), therefore the authoritative guardians of the *depositum fidei* (the faith committed to their trust: I Timothy 6: 20.)[6]

The validity of Apostolic Succession was, above all and first of all, made dependent upon the legitimacy of the induction into Orders *(ordinatio legitima,* Cyprianus, Ep. 69, 3). In the first few centuries the transmission of plenary powers and of gifts of Grace by the imposition of hands are but rarely mentioned—for the first time in II Timothy 1: 6—the Grace of the Ministry was regarded as a free divine gift, the bestowal of which in the ordination prayer was invoked from God alone. Even in the prayer used today in the ordination of deacons the Orthodox bishops say: "Not by the laying on of my hands, but by the sending down of Thy rich mercies is grace given to them who are worthy of Thee."[7] The vital important point in "succession" was the legitimate election by the presbytery and the opportunity. The coöperation of other bishops in the induction into office of the newly elected bishop appears originally to have borne the character of control and witness, rather than of formal ordination (consecration). It is remarkable that Cyprianus, who writes at length about the election of the Roman bishop Cornelius (Ep. 55: 7), although mentioning the presence and coöperation of numerous bishops, says nothing about laying on of hands by them. According to the Eighth Book of the Apostolic Constitutions (4, 2*ff*), containing a description of episcopal consecration in Syria, there was no imposition of hands, merely the laying of the Book of the Gospels upon the head of the bishop to be consecrated.

Gradually, however, opinions on the validity of Apostolic Succession underwent a change, inasmuch as the episcopal imposition of hands was looked upon as essential. It appears that this view first asserted itself in the Roman community. The first historical evidence for this is the letter of the Roman bishop Cornelius to the Antiochian bishop Fabian (251 A. D.), in which the former reports on the unlawful assumption of the episcopal office by Novatian. The latter had, he states, by cunning and force induced two foolish Italian rural bishops to bestow upon him the dignity of a bishop "by make-believe and invalid imposition of hands" *(eikoniké kai nataîa cheirce pithesîa).* Cornelius rejects this imposition of hands as invalid, but the expression he uses shows that at that time in Rome the imposition of hands was looked upon as essential in assuming episcopal office (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* VI, 43). By this laying on of hands, it was believed, the plenary powers bestowed by Christ upon His Apostles were, so to

---

[6] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haeres,* III, 31: "Traditionem itaque apostolorum in toto mundo manifestatem, in omni eccesia adest respicere omnibus qui vera velint videre: et habemus annumerare eos qui ab apostolis instituti sunt episcopi, et successores eorum usque ad nos . . ."—III, 2, 2: . . . Traditionem, quae est ab apostolis, quae per successiones presbyterorum in ecclesiis custoditur . . ."—IV, 26, 3: Eis qui in Ecclesia sunt presbyteris obaudire oportet, his qui successionem habent ab apostolis . . . qui eum episcopatus successions charisma veritatis certum . . . acceperunt."

[7] M. Rajewski: *Euchologion of the Orthodox Catholic Church,* II, Vienna, 1861, 71.

speak, propagated by a spiritual Act of Witness. The *bishop* became not only the sole consecrator of bishops, but also the sole legitimate ordainer of priests and other ministers.[8]

Nevertheless, certain very distinct remnants of the original method of ordination by the presbytery have been preserved, firstly in the fact, that for a long time, even into the eighth century, in cases of urgency presbyters were ordained by presbyters; and then secondly, above all, in the fact that to this day even in the Church of Rome at the ordination of priests all priests present lay their hands on the newly ordained priest. Thus the presbyter Paphnutius in the desert ordained a monk named Daniel as his successor as deacon and presbyter. The priests sent as messengers of the Gospel to the German tribes ordained others to the priesthood, and in other ways also performed episcopal functions. Even the scholastics seriously debated the question whether, with papal permission, ordinary priests were qualified to ordain. In 1400 A. D. Pope Boniface granted to an English abbot the privilege of ordaining priests, but withdrew it in 1403 A. D. A bull of Innocent VIII has been preserved, according to which the Cistercian abbots were permitted in ordain deacons. (J. Sägmüller: *Manual of Catholic Canon Law*, I, 1914, 202.) That the office of bishop merely represents a higher grade of the office or order of priests and that the latter is the fundamental ecclesiastical office, is shown to this day by that regulation in Roman Canon Law, according to which the consecration of a bishop can never be performed *per saltum*, that is to say, without previous ordination to the priesthood, so that episcopal consecration without previous valid ordination to the priesthood is invalid.

How slowly the change or advance of views on Apostolic Succession—from simple legitimate succession to office into the more elaborate view of transmission of apostolic plenary powers by the laying on of hands—was effected is proved by the estimation of the value of ordination performed outside the Catholic community by heretica and schismatica.[9] The Eastern Church, and the African Church under its influence recognized baptism as valid only if administered within (*i. e.*, by the) Church; sacraments administered outside the Church even sacraments administered by unworthy servants of the Church had to be repeated. As opposed to this view the Church of Rome, in accordance with the judicial principle of the objective sacramental effect, maintained the validity of baptism administered in the correct ecclesiastical form; it rejected all repetition of baptism, and, in the event of the return to the fold as such as had seceded from the Church, confined itself to "reconciliation" by laying on of hands, which, however, was to a certain extent regarded as the repetition of the sacrament of confirmation.

---

[8] Compare *Canones Hyppoliti* 4, 30 (Achelis 61): "Episcopus in omnibus rebus aequiparetur presbytero excepto nomine cathedrae et ordinatione, quia potestas ordinandi ipsi non tribuitur."

[9] Compare Louis Saltet's work with its wealth of documentary evidence; "Les réordinations, Etudes sur le sacrement des ordres," Paris, 1907, also Swete-Turner and Sägmüller.

After hard struggles this objective-judicial view of the Church of Rome prevailed in the East and in the West. If, however, the correctly administered heretical baptism was to be regarded as valid, it became logically necessary to accept as valid all the other sacraments and ordinations of the heretics and schismatics. This consequence was first clearly recognized by Augustine. The great champion of sacramental *opus operatum*, the fighter against the Donatists, who made the efficacy of the sacraments dependent upon the personal qualities of the priestly dispenser, also defended the validity of ordination administered outside the Church, and rejected all reordination. "Both (baptism and ordination) are sacraments . . . therefore neither must be repeated in the Catholic Church." Clerics returning to the fold from schism, who are permitted to carry on their previous ministry (ecclesiastical functions) "are not re-ordained; both baptism and ordination has remained intact in them (*mansit integra*); inasmuch as the error was due to separation, and not to the sacraments, which are the same everywhere. But even if the Church should consider it advisable that priests returning to the Catholic communion should not be permitted to continue in their clerical office, the sacrament of ordination which they have received is not repudiated (*detrahuntur*), but is retained by them. That is why (in the ceremony of reconciliation) there is no laying on of hands in the presence of the people, not to prevent injustice to the man, but to the sacrament itself." (*Contr. Ep. Parmen*, II, 28.) Rome herself, in like manner as the Eastern Church, only recognized this logical consequence very gradually and hesitatingly. In the East and in the West it was centuries before the validity of orders dispensed by the heretica and schismatica was established beyond all doubt. Again and again the Church reverted to the custom of re-ordination of heretical and schismatical priests. The Church of Rome, in fact, even as late as the beginning of the eleventh century, rejected the orders of the Simonians and Schismatics, and in such cases administered at least partial re-ordination. It was the influence of the great scholastics, above all Alexander of Hales and Thomas of Aquino (St. Thomas Aquinas), that in the West helped the Augustinian view to gain its final conclusive victory.

Since the later Middle Ages the Church of Rome regards every correctly administered sacramental consecration and ordination outside its own fold as valid, although it strictly condemns the conferment of same as illegal and prohibited. Priests and bishops of the Eastern Churches (which latter Rome looks upon as schismatical or heretical), on joining the Church of Rome, are fully recognized in their office and received into the fold. In addition to those of the Eastern Church, Rome acknowledges in principle the validity of the orders of: (1) the Church of Utrecht and the Old Catholic Churches, likewise the Mariavitic Church of Poland, who received their Apostolic Succession from the former; (2) the Gallic Church, whose succession goes back to the Jacobitic patriarchate of Antioch; (3) the Evangelical Catholic communion in England, which received its episcopates from a Jacobitic bishop of Southern India. Nevertheless, priests going over to Rome

from these Western Churches are not always permitted to exercise their clerical functions. Furthermore, the Eastern Orthodox Church also recognizes the orders of the Monophysitical and Nestorian Churches, now also the orders of the Church of Rome. The Russian Church up to the eighteenth century and the Greek Church up to quite recent times doubted the validity of baptism as administered in the Western Church by affusion only, and in the case of converts repeated the baptism. This naturally also involved the calling into question of the validity of all the other sacraments. The critical determinative point, in the eyes of the Church of Rome, for the validity of ordinations outside the latter, is the correct performance of the sacramental act (whether according to the Pontificale Romanum, or according to the liturgical tradition of the various Eastern Churches), as well as the "*intentio faciendi quod fecit ecclesia*," the intention to do what the Catholic Church does. The validity of the consecration of a bishop is, however, according to the Roman view, dependent upon the legitimacy of his election, inasmuch as such legitimacy, according to Roman Canon Law exists only if the Pope has issued a direct or (as in the case of the unified Churches of the East) an indirect mandate for the consecration of a bishop. Apostolic Succession is therefore, according to this view, no longer dependent upon canonical legitimacy, but is on the contrary confined to the unbroken chain of sacramental imposition of hands.

The Orthodox Church of the East, too, considers the imposition of hands by the bishops the vital essential point in Apostolic Succession; in keeping, however, with its pneumatological original character, the Orthodox Church does not lay the same weight upon formal judicial correctness as the Church of the Rome. It reserves to itself the liberty (*kat' oikonomian, i. e.*, in the "domestic economy" of the divine treasure entrusted to its keeping) to make absolutely valid even unecumenical and incomplete orders.

Whosoever considers the history of the Church's ministry and its Apostolic Succession with an unbiased mind cannot fail to gather the impression that we are confronted with a magnificent development of the germs of Primitive Christianity. True as in other questions of faith, for example sacramental doctrine, it took centuries before the Catholic Church attained to a full, clear understanding of the meaning of what had been laid down and decided in embryo from the very beginning in the faith and practice of Christendom, as also it took a long time before perfect clear understanding was vouchsafed to the Church on the question of Apostolic Succession, which latter appertains to both the sacramental and the canonical sphere. The fact of the matter is, the Christian Church is not a system which dropped finished, perfect, and complete from heaven to earth; it is a divinely created living organism, which had to pass through a gradual process of growth, subject to every possible form of hindrance, repression, suppression, crises, and reaction. It is a sign of abstract and mechanical doctrinarianism if we try to set up this embryonic or infantile stage of this organism as an unchangeable immutable standard.

Even though the emergence of the monarchical episcopate does not belong to an earlier period than the beginning of the second century, and the discovery of episcopal succession to the end of the second century, and the binding rule of episcopal imposition of hands to a later period still—all that is no argument against the logical sequence of this development, in which God's Will is indubitably manifested. As in the doctrine of the Trinity and in Christology, in the doctrine of Grace, of the sacraments, we see, here too, a divinely willed, divinely governed development, the character of which is really and truly ecumenical, because it took place uniformly both in the East and in the West. In the tripartition of the priestly office (deacon, priest, bishop) vibrates the triadic rhythm of the eternal divine life; in the monarchical bishop the ascended Christ, the invisible Head of the Church, becomes visible; and in the chain of bishops, consecrated by episcopal imposition of hands, the unbroken continuity is visualized, which unites the Church of the twentieth century with the Primitive Church: "*Ecclesia ab apostolis, apostoli a Christo, Christus a Deo*" (Tertullian: *De Praescr.* 37). Only puritanically distorted vision is incapable of recognizing value inherent in succession transmitted by episcopal laying on of hands.—*The Living Church.*

Glimpses of France

Stanley Manning

That is all we succeeded in obtaining, for Paris was our only stop, and Paris is too big and too diverse to afford more than glimpses of itself in six days. For some reason Dr. Macpherson had received no replies to his letters trying to make contacts with certain individuals there, so we did not have the opportunity for that personal acquaintance that we had in many other cities, which alone is revealing of the spirit of a country. If we had met some of the intellectual and religious leaders, as we did elsewhere, our impressions might have been very different; as it was, most of us were disappointed.

Prosperous France

More than any country we have visited this summer, France seems prosperous. Prices are high; there seems to be very little unemployment, and the poverty does not seem so poor. Our journey took us northwestward clear across the country from Geneva to Paris by way of Dijon, and then from Paris to Cherbourg through Caen. We did not get into the mining and industrial region which lies to the north of our route. It was mostly a prosperous-appearing farming country through which we traveled—pleasant river valleys and wide-reaching plains, reminding one very much of our own middle west, except that fields and farm were smaller. But judging only by outward appearance, France seems to be better off financially than any other country.

Paris Contrasts

Paris presents to the stranger so many and such diverse aspects that he is puzzled to understand or describe it. After a very short ride through its streets he can well understand why the Germans retreated from the Marne when they saw the Paris taxicabs coming. They are deadly weapons, and one wonders that there are not almost continuous fatalities. Yet opposed to this demoniac, chance-taking speed is the leisurely pace of pedestrians. In many places on the boulevards half the width of the sidewalks is obstructed with cafe tables, so that one could not hurry if he wished. Even the subway is not in a hurry; there are no express trains, and if one is going any considerable distance he is almost sure to have to change cars at least once or twice. Yet, aside from speed, the subway seems at least as good as New York's, and the second-class fare, which nearly every one pays, is only seventy centimes, the equivalent of less than three cents. The first-class fare, which assures one of less crowded cars, is about four and a half cents.

Probably no city in the world has so many wide and beautiful boulevards in the heart of its business district as Paris has. And close by are such narrow streets that a push cart is the largest vehicle that can negotiate them. Some buildings, however, are being torn down and new and wider streets are to be laid out, but compared with Rome, for instance, the amount accomplished is very little.

The Louvre is without doubt the world's greatest museum of painting. Here, under one roof, with miles of galleries, are gathered many of the world's masterpieces, and there is an effort to present the whole history of painting, except that, with possibly rare exceptions, the works of no living artists are admitted. These are to be found elsewhere, in the Luxembourg, the Petit Palais, and of course at the time of the Grand Salon in the Grand Palais. Most of our Good Will party visited the Louvre, and a number saw the other museums. But again we were impressed with the futility of museums, except as a very unsatisfactory means of making pictures available to great numbers of people. The pictures that can make the greatest impression are those that have been painted for a particular place, perhaps a church, and are not spoiled by the nearness of many others.

In the Louvre the only work that is placed so as to be properly seen and appreciated is the Venus de Milo, which stands alone at the end of a long corridor which affords a vista, which any real work of art needs.

Here, too, we saw Millet's "Angelus," "The Gleaners" and "Shepherdess," and a few days later visited Barbizon, where he lived and worked, and a few miles away saw the fields and the little church that appear in "The Angelus."

Another contrast that is interesting is that between the delightful courtesy which we ordinarily associate with the French and an unfeeling carelessness toward learning English, which would make trade with many of their best customers so much easier.

I made an attempt to find a Paris friend of a friend of mine, in a section of the city where there are very few English-speaking people. I could not speak enough French to make myself understood, but with the help of a written address I managed to let people know where I wanted to go. Five different individuals put themselves to considerable inconvenience to help me, the last a servant girl in a small hotel who could speak enough English to serve as interpreter. I wondered how many of us at home would do as they did, in order to assist a foreigner who did not know enough to speak our language.

And then there are the great stores, some of which advertise that their clerks speak English, but where, when one visits them, he finds it very difficult to find one who can understand it. This is probably not true of the exclusive shops that cater particularly to English and American travelers, but the great bulk of tourists do not have the money to patronize the exclusive places, and go to the big stores on the boulevards or the small shops on the side streets.

Then there is the opera, and the theaters. A number of our party heard "Rigoletto" one evening and were delighted with the presentation, although it is probable that the greater artists are elsewhere during the summer, either on a holiday, or singing in the South American capitals, where the winter season is now at its height.

A number went to the "Follies," which do not differ greatly from similar productions at home. There are far more suggestive turns on the American stage and an equal absence of clothes. One does not need to go to Paris if that is what he wants.

But Paris is far ahead of us in the application of common sense to censorship in the theater. The play "Maya," which was barred in New York and London, is being played in English in one of the small theaters in Paris. Although it centers around the life of a prostitute, there is not a single indecent or suggestive line or gesture in it. It is true drama. A city that permits the Follies, and worse, and bans "Maya" is simply making itself ridiculous. Sometime we shall learn that it is perfectly possible to deal with the world-old problems of the relationships of the sexes in a frank and decent way as "Maya" does, and exercise our censorship upon those productions whose only purpose is to pander to a depraved taste.

But Paris does not do that. Those who have been there before say there is a difference to-day from conditions a few years ago, and that displays that were then permitted are no longer allowed. It may be so. But there is evidently no attempt to banish or hide prostitution. So far as the public conscience is concerned, it does not seem to be recognized as an evil, except when it leads to disease. There is open solicitation upon the streets—not furtively in dark corners, but openly, and where the lights are brightest—such as would not be tolerated anywhere at home. That is another side of the strange conglomerate which is Paris—where art and music are appreciated at least as highly as anywhere on earth, and where with this fine appreciation of beauty, human degradation is apparently accepted as an inevitable part of life.

The Shadow of Napoleon

The most vivid impression which Paris made upon some of us, at least, was the large place which Napoleon occupies in the thought and affection of the people to-day. Perhaps it is not fair to say, but it appears true to the casual visitor, that Great Britain is an empire in form and a democracy at heart, while France is a republic in form, but an empire at heart.

They look back to the time of Napoleon as their golden age, when France was dominant in nearly all of Europe. No other place is visited constantly by such throngs as crowd the tomb of Napoleon. The great marble casket is placed in open crypt, so that every one who comes to see must bow before the Emperor. Here are the battle flag and other trophies, and all that can go to make "the pomp and circumstance of glorious war." As one of our party suggested, what chance has any pacifist propaganda in the face of all that?

It is so easy to forget Waterloo. France apparently has done so. Jena and Austerlitz and the Italian campaign loom large. Moscow and Waterloo are lost in the golden glow of the days of empire. The glories of the Bourbon kings at Versailles and Fontainebleau are eagerly visited; there seem to be no shrines of the Revolution that set humanity ahead.

The outlines of the old Bastille are marked by rows of paving stones in a busy square over which the city traffic passes heedlessly.

One would like to know what would happen if the remarkable work of the mad artist Antoine Wiertz, now in the museum in Brussels that was formerly his home, was hung near Napoleon's tomb. Probably it would be torn to bits by an angry mob of one hundred per cent patriots. The picture portrays Napoleon in hell, tormented by the souls of those who were widowed or orphaned by his stupendous failure to make France mistress of the world. France will have to see that picture before peace in Europe is assured.—*The Christian Leader.*

Talkies Deluxe

Will Hays' favorite rhapsodist, Carl Milliken, is again going in for bigger and better "talkies." Picture the oratorical politician standing before the annual convention of the National Education Association held recently in Los Angeles and you have the setting and the *dramatis personae* of the new comedy skit put on by Mr. Milliken.

The less said about the plot of the playlet the better, for all of Mr. Milliken's plots, regardless of how subtle, rather invariably concern themselves with the Hollywood coffers.

There are several scenes in the play, however, which might bear hasty analysis. For example: Act I, Scene I.

Mr. Milliken, (*assuming the never-to-be-forgotten attitude of the Governor he once was, speaking with that finality he learned when he spoke to his former constituency*) "The burden of adapting education to provide new standards for living as well as to meet the demands of the machine-age rests chiefly upon the teachers of the young. Within

you is the power to plant seeds of discriminating choices." With no intent to minimize the obligation and tremendous responsibility of the nation's teachers, those heavy words would ring more true were they not so nearly identical with those Mr. Milliken vainly tried to force upon the ministers a year or so since. And then, there still remain a few of us who feel that we have an over-supply of new standards, set by Hollywood and that some of the very standards Hollywood has relegated to the scrap-heap are more worthy of the concern of the country's educators than the standards Mr. Milliken would urge the teachers to adapt.

Act II, Scene II.

Mr. Milliken still speaking. "The motion picture theater, where it is possible for the spectator to participate vicariously in the thrills and emotions of his romanticized self, the actor. Pictures deal with human problems (and possibilities) and the individual sitting in the theater unconsciously *identifies himself with the actor on the screen.*"

That, my friends, is an admission of such frankness as I never expected from our oral friend. That is just what you and I have been trying to tell him and his producer group. That is the very thing against which we have risen to protest. There is where the damning influence of an improper picture lurks. That is why the youth on the street, free of specialized and defined inclination toward wrong, enters a theater and comes out burnt and seared and begrimed, by having been forced by Mr. Milliken and the irresponsible group he would bespeak, to "participate, vicariously in the thrills and emotions" of crime, lust, brutality, infidelity, licentiousness and all the rotten ilk, which crowd the larger portions of films he is forced to witness.

Now let's go back a moment. Mr. Milliken has just publicly stated that the one who sees one of his films experiences its thrills and emotions as though they were in reality his. Then why in heaven's name does he tell the teachers of the nation that the responsibility of adapting education to provide new standards for the pupil is theirs? Is there not a suggestion of responsibility, to the present quite overlooked by the motion picture producer, which is in truth their responsibility?

People of culture and insight are not fooled by the ex-governor's attempt at suavity and diplomacy of statement. When he compliments the educators on their "marvellous advance in the last fifty years," Milliken alone is fooled. They are not. The *modus operandi* of the Tsar's mouthpiece is so evident, so juvenile as to be ludicrous. An eight-year-old would understand that he would sue for the good will of the country's educational leaders, that he would sugar-coat the pill, that his employers pay him a salary for so doing. We begin to tire of the bag of tricks he gathered in his political campaign. Those weary of words and half words would relish action.

Milliken says, "The industry has an open mind and solicits your help not only in its self-regulation but in seeing that patrons of pictures derive from the screen the greatest amount of education and culture that is possible." Unsupported by fact, his statement that the

mind of the industry is open, lacks conviction, to some who believe that the mind of the industry, as proven by increasingly objectionable films, is permanently closed. If contrary to that belief, the mind is open and Hays and Milliken are accomplishing as little as is thus far evident for the cleaning up of the movies, it is time someone else, actually interested in cleaner movies, try the jobs. Let Hays and Milliken go back to politics, where they belong. The industry's pocket book is open for your shekels and, as long as they fall, the mind will stay closed. Depend upon that, and depend upon it also that as long as pictures stay where they are the nation's educators will experience no little difficulty in seeing that movie patrons get any amount of education or culture out of the pictures. It is simply not there to get.

It would have been to the everlasting glory of Milliken and of the avid power he represents had the Educators' convention been able to rise and say to him as he said to them, "*Remembering the tradition behind you and witnessing the performance of today, we look with confidence and high hopes. In your hands Young America is safe*"—but they could not.—*J. M. R. The Expositor.*

The Ecumenical Methodist Conference

HAYNIE SUMMERS

Five hundred and fifty delegates, 220 of them from overseas, besides hundreds of visitors from other lands and from every state in the Union, making an audience the largest Atlanta ever had, representing all races, all nations from every continent under the sun—all followers of Wesley—met in a great family reunion in Atlanta, October 16 to 26, 1931, for the Sixth Ecumenical Methodist Conference.

This conference attracted an unusual assembly of intellectual, religious and altruistic greatness. There were 111 men and women on a much diversified program, based on the general theme, "Methodism in the Life of To-day." Four group meetings in as many churches were held daily, and discussion was invited.

Important international problems were discussed, and the attitude of Methodism has been summed up in pronouncements as follows:

World Peace—The church should educate for peace. It should talk peace. It should think peace. War must go or civilization goes.

Marriage—We are concerned for the sanctity of marriage. We hear much in these days about full sex experience and trial marriages. The church can never meet its full responsibility by opposing divorce; it may even advocate uniform laws in all sections of the nation and still fall short of its obligation. The church must give full instruction to its youth as to the beauty of love and the sanctity of marriage.

War Debts—There ought to be some readjustment of war debts.

Disarmament—The church ought to keep before the citizens of its nation the solemn obligation to disarm, assumed by each of the allied nations when Germany was forced to disarm.

War Service—It is difficult to see how any nation which forever renounces war as a national policy can deny citizenship to any man,

otherwise fit, who must inquire of God and his conscience whether a war is just before he will take up arms.

Religious Education—Churches are right in their emphasis when they insist on adequate programs of religious education and the bringing up of their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.

Reunion of All Protestants—No church is in better position to speak of the reunion of Protestantism. In its very heart and soul Methodism is prepared to say to other Christian communions of the world, "If thy heart is as my heart then give me thy hand."

Unification—In England three Methodist churches are uniting next year. This ought to inspire us to renewed efforts for the unification of Methodism in the United States.

Prohibition—The liquor traffic has been a social evil and has had other social evils as its allies. We appeal to Methodist laymen, for the sake of their children and others' children, to obey the laws of their lands, as they relate to the sale of alcoholic liquors.

Atheism and Christianity—Atheists in Russia turn to childhood and youth when they would destroy religion. We must turn to childhood and youth to make the world Christian.

Youth—Intelligent youth can be held only by ministers who know the language of this day. The best preacher in the world will face small congregations unless the program of his church meets the individual and social needs of the community.

Race—Racial antagonisms create hatreds everywhere. We must insist that all in any dominant group who call themselves Christians bestir themselves against unfair discriminations and injustices. Strife comes when one group is unfair and another hates.

The Church—The church must stand for great principles of right. It may not have a political or economic program, but it must lend its influence to every proposal for human betterment. Methodism is not bigotry, but it is forever interested in a Christian Social Order.

Non-Christian World—The non-Christian world is in deep distress. Hunger and sickness are everywhere. Minds are starved. Social needs are neglected and the old social structure in many lands is being subjected to a strain it can not stand. Moral supports are gone. A new spirit of bitterness toward the white race is marked by unprecedented intensity, and the faiths of the fathers are challenged. At the foot of the cross let us purge our souls of all racial arrogance, all contempt for other races and peoples, all desire for spiritual or other domination over men, and go forward to minister humbly and loyally to men who need him.

The Church and Economics—The church could never formulate an economic program, but it must support with courage every program of economic justice and hold ever before the business world the principles of human rights. God forbid that the church should be indifferent either to the tragic suffering of these days or to the underlying causes of our economic distress. Spiritual bankruptcy would follow such indifference.

Thus Methodism's pronouncements on world problems may be summarized. The discussions were led by able men, and it is safe to say that those having a part in the discussions went away with a better understanding of their obligations and responsibilities to their church and its work in the world.

Addresses by President Hoover and Vice-President Curtis were heard. President Hoover spoke from the White House over the radio. Among other things he said: "The church is faced with the duty of balancing the people's sense of values, and keeping materialism from gaining complete ascendency in all matters."

He also stressed the vital need for world peace at a time when nations are groaning under the burden of debts incurred in past wars. He closed with an appeal to the conference to unite with all other religious bodies in a world-wide drive for universal peace.

Vice-President Curtis was in Atlanta for the first session of the Conference. Mr. Curtis also spoke for peace. He said, as reported in the daily press:

"There is a desperate urge and need for the nations to go back humbly to the spirit of 'love thy neighbor as thyself,' and to create a sentiment of good will and forbearance leading to a fixed policy of arbitration of international differences.

"I take it the only way the greatly to be desired universal peace can be had is by man's cultivating good will toward his fellow man, and by refraining to exercise brute force with which to impose the will of one man or one nation on another, and by submitting differences of opinion to important tribunals for arbitration."

The day following the close of the conference many of the visitors journeyed to Savannah, Ga., the scene of John Wesley's efforts.

One newspaper reporter who attended every important session was amazed that hell was not mentioned in his hearing, so he sought out Dr. Ryder C. Smith, president of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, England, and Bishop Frederick D. Leete of Omaha, and asked them this question:

"What has become of hell?"

Dr. Smith replied, "You can't have been going to church much lately or you would know we don't talk much about hell now. Hell in England is a living thing. It is present when character is degraded to the point where the individual can not find and does not long for God."

Bishop Leete said: "We perhaps don't stress hell as much as we ought to, but the man who turns his back on God, separates himself from God and is in hell. There are people right in Atlanta, living in hell, now. It is a matter of individual choice whether a man attains one or the other objective. God sends no man either to heaven or hell. We are under the law of character, and there can be no character without a choice between good and evil."

This is mentioned because the old doctrine of hellfire and brimstone continues to be preached from Methodist pulpits all over the South, and it was an opportune time for this reporter to get another viewpoint. *Christian Leader.*

Murdering Devotion

To the Editor of The Living Church:

A score of years ago I wrote you a letter deploring the choir-wise pews in our school and college chapels, and earnestly advocating that the pews, or better, chairs, be placed cross-wise, *facing* the altar and pulpit. I strongly believe that this, only, Anglican method is most detrimental to the devotion of our boys and young men, actually killing to a greater or less extent their devotion and worship. It is bad enough for the choir boys in the chancel, but that seems necessary, as they are singing, supposedly, to lead the congregation. But for the naves of our chapels to have long choir-wise pews prevents their occupants from following the Catholic rule, which I always taught my Sunday school children, "Knees on the ground; eyes on the Cross; hearts in heaven!" To face one another moves and tempts them to smile at each other, and is so distracting that they bury their faces in their hands, and hardly follow the service at all, and never see and watch (as they should) the celebrant at the altar, supposed to be leading them in the great Memorial Sacrifice. And for the preacher in the pulpit to *see* the faces of only half of his hearers is surely unsatisfactory, as well as for those in the pews on the pulpit side, to have to twist their necks to get a look at him! Only Anglicans tolerate this custom, not Roman Catholics or Protestants. I firmly believe that this accounts for the frequent loss of devotion and reverence among our Church youth. It is a very unfortunate and mistaken tradition, and I wrote to Fr. Sill I was most glad that *he* had broken it in his new chapel at Kent School, Connecticut. I verily wish that all our Church chapels could be changed over, and earnestly hope all new ones being built hereafter may follow this reasonable plea. Bad traditions should be broken! Another one is "compulsory college chapel." It was given up at Harvard forty-five years ago. Take a "referendum" on these two points among our boys and young men and see what they say. Today we need to do all we possibly can to revive and increase the devotion and reverence of our youth, and not to murder it.

Providence, R. I. (Rev.) Henry M. Saville.

Living Church.

Book Review

(When ordering books, please mention this Magazine.)
NOTE—*Reviews, when not signed, are by the Editor.*

The Religion of Jesus and Love the Law of Life, by *Toyohiko Kagawa.* Translated by Helen F. Topping and J. Fullerton Gressitt with biographical sketches by Robert E. Speer, Eleanor M. Hinder and Helen F. Topping and a Foreword by Rufus M. Jones. The John C. Winston Company, Chicago, 1931. 313 pages, $2.50.

A short while ago the Christian world knew nothing of Kagawa, the Japanese Christian and leader; today he almost occupies the center of the stage, sharing rank with a world figure like Gandhi and crowding Stanley Jones into second or third place. The man has written many books but this one is the first in English translation, as far as we know. What he writes is well worth knowing. It is a warm, practical, concrete interpretation of Christian life, showing a surprisingly large range of general information and, equally, a habit and power of independent thought. But his life is more eloquent and arresting than his books.

He was born in 1888 in Kobe, Japan. Through an English Bible class he was brought to Christ. His Christian life began with a vision of the cross of Christ, and this has ever been the motive power of his life. Graduating from high school he announced that he would study for the Christian ministry, and was turned out by his uncle who had cared for him, without a penny. He entered a Christian college in Tokyo. He was a brilliant student, a voracious reader and able to retain all he read. When he had finished his studies he moved into a slum district of Kobe where ten thousand people were crowded into an area covering only five or six blocks. Poverty, immorality and all kinds of vices had full sway there. He gave his life entirely to the wretched men around him, often lived on three yen ($1.50) a month, in order to keep them from starving. In 1915 he went to America and studied for two years in Princeton Seminary, taking special courses at the university. Returning to Japan he engaged in activities of an incredible variety, such as regular preaching, Bible lectures, evangelistic services, lectures on economics, city planning, universal suffrage. He became a leader and organizer of the labor movement. At one time watched and persecuted as a dangerous radical, he is now by the authorities regarded as a defense against Bolshevism. In all his work his wife has been one with him. At first the note of his humanitarian work was largely social. But his Christianity was so real and fundamental that soon he found the ever springing fountain for all his activities in his faith. He is in himself the complete combination of the social and personal gospel. He is always seeking to translate the gospel

into human conduct, to live by it himself and to lead the church in Japan, and the nation itself, to take Christ as real master and Lord and follow him.

This is the meaning and purpose of the "Kingdom-of-God movement." Its ideal is the recovering of the Church of the New Testament and making it the power of shaping the life of the nation.

The two books under discussion are not theological treatises. As Kagawa's own life is a life of action, so is the emphasis in his writings on the practical side of the Christian religion. The cross, so we heard, is central in his faith. However, he gives no new theory of the atonement. Even as Jesus showed his faith in God and his love for men preeminently in his death, which was the death of willing sacrifice, so are we required, in this world of desperate need and warring interests, to live out our faith in self-sacrifice. Christ's example becomes the energizing inspiration of his disciples.

Love is the law of the true, the Christian life. This was the religion of Jesus; it is the spirit of the life of this unique Japanese Christian. To become acquainted with his life, to read his books is to see that the miracle of the church of the New Testament can be, has been repeated today. The Western world has taught the East many things and Japan has profited, more than any other nation from the West. But in Kagawa and his converts the East is paying back some of this debt. If we were as willing to learn from the East in this respect, our reward would be immeasurable.

Splendor of God, by *Honore Willsee Morrow*. William Morrow and Company, New York, 1929, 376 pages.

Historical novels may have their drawbacks insofar as the author is forced to draw considerably on his creative imagination. Still in the hands of a true artist they invest their heroes with life and reality and the shadowy figures of the past move before us as though they were our contemporaries. Mrs. Morrow, writer of many books, has put out three volumes on Lincoln, the last of which, "The Last Full Measure" we have read with decided interest. In the book before us, with the strange title, her hero is *Adoniram Judson*, the famous Baptist missionary, the first Christian missionary to Burma. It is a story of entrancing interest. We did not know much about Judson when we opened its pages, but now the missionary stands before us as one of Christ's choicest followers, a man of faith and fortitude like few others. Soon after the founding of the American Board of Foreign Missions he was sent out, arriving in Rangun, Burma, in 1813. To convert a native Burmese to the Christian faith was considered a capital crime. All that he and his devoted wife could do was to learn the language, translate parts of the Bible into the native tongue, build a little tabernacle, and wait for an opening. In the meantime they bore sickness, danger and hostility with exemplary patience. When the war between Britain and Burma broke out in 1824, Judson was seized and put into the death house, suspected as a spy. For seventeen months he was confined in the loathsome jails of Ava, bound with

three pairs of fetters. His sufferings from fever, heat, hunger, the filth of the place and the cruelty of his keepers were excruciating. Mrs. Judson also suffered, although not imprisoned. By her persistent entreaties and finally by the demand of the English general he was at the end of two years released. The description of these horrible prison experiences is one of the most pathetic features of the book. Soon after his release his wife, of whom the author draws a most touching picture, died.

His almost never ending sufferings at times clouded his soul. He sought consolation in Madam Guyon's writings, in Christian and, to some extent, in Buddhist mysticism. But after being married to Mrs. Sarah H. Boardman, the young widow of a fellow-missionary, he found his Christian equilibrium again. Here the book ends.

He carried on until 1850, when after converting many, translating the whole Bible and almost completing a large Burman and English dictionary, he died after thirty-seven years of missionary labors.

The book is based on numerous, dependable sources. It is written with entire honesty, without any noticeable attempt to idealize. A story so well done, so ably told that you want to read it from first to last.

The Present and Future of Religion, by *C. E. M. Joad.* Ernest Benn Limited, London and Southampton, 1930. 224 pages.

The author discusses here the religious situation in England, but in a general way his analysis applies to our own country. It is his conviction, he says, that the need to believe is fundamental, but that the religion preached by the Churches does not satisfy this need; that, therefore, either a new religion will take the field or the Churches must cease to maintain propositions in flagrant contradiction with known facts. He gives strong proofs for the contention that there is a general decline in organized religion. Especially the young people show a very pronounced indifference to the church and its teachings. Today, he says, you can know a man for years without finding out whether he is a Christian or an atheist. The War has done much to shake people's belief in a God who cares or in a church that is a safe guide. The organized church itself is in a state of disintegration. The Anglo-Catholics are fighting for reservation of the sacrament and the Evangelicals consider it a relapse into Popery. We hear much about the virgin birth. To the outside it seems as though the church was engaged in clerical fiddling while Rome burns.

Physical science has been digging away the foundation of many old beliefs, and now comes psychoanalysis claiming to free repressed instincts and thereby leading to their sublimation, while we had always thought that suppression was the legitimate course. The spirit of the age seems to be a disrespect for all authority. Having lost our faith in a hereafter we make the most of this world. We are engaged in the pursuit of pleasure; but such a life leads to illusion. People are bored and the cocktail is the only drink that stimulates them. Those never achieve happiness who seek it as their immediate goal, happiness

comes as a by-product when you are engaged in something else that is worthwhile.

The universe is not worshipful to the modern man and there are no elements that are worshipful, therefore there is no use taking trouble about it. And man's highest desire is to express himself; why trouble about morality? Morality is a product of social development, not a categorical imperative as old as the ages and as permanent. Scepticism in points of belief and fatalism (irresponsibility) in points of conduct always go hand in hand.

What, then, is necessary if religion is to survive? The churches must divest themselves of beliefs that science has shown to be false. They have a double duty, the duty toward our neighbor and the duty towards God.

In regard to the first it is an encouraging sign that the social viewpoint is stressed more today, although it sometimes looks as though the preachers were speaking more of secular affairs than of spiritual; as though civilization received more attention than religion. In the past religion and the church have often been used by governments to teach the people obedience, by the rich to keep the poor contented with their lot. It was given to the submerged as a compensation for the renunciation demanded by society and culture. Today we look upon it as a means of making this world better and raising the disinherited to a level enjoyed by the fortunate. The individual and even the whole youth of the land—the old people are too conservative—can do little to better the present state of society. It takes a long time to right old wrongs, to bring about a new age.

The chapter on duties to God is rather disappointing. The author says the essence of religion is to him mysticism. He is not himself a mystic but he believes that the mystic gets in touch with a higher world of values, which gives him an exalted, if fleeting, experience of its reality. But a "world of higher values" will not suffice as a substitute for God. The writer makes the strange statement that it is impossible to conceive of a God permanent and perfect in relation with the imperfect world; that the religious man cannot become one with him. How, then, does the mystic get in touch with him? or is there no God in the world of higher values? If we have no God any more and cannot get into fellowship with him, then we have no religion any more, then the whole religious development of the race ends in futility!

The author says in the Introduction, that he writes neither as a sceptic nor as a believer; only as an absorbed spectator, who wants to know why people believe as they do. His interest is, therefore, merely philosophical. Religion cannot be understood, described or interpreted by one who is only an absorbed spectator. He may be satisfied with what is vaguely described as a world of higher values. Not so the believer, his "heart and flesh cry out for the living God." Even if his enemies—or philosophy—taunt him saying, Where is thy God now? he is not long dismayed. "Hope thou in God," he says to his soul; "for I shall yet praise him, who is the health of my countenance and my God."

Karl Barth Prophet of a New Christianity? by *Wilhelm Pauck*, Professor of Church History and Historical Theology at the Chicago Theological Seminary. 1931. Harper and Brothers, Publishers, New York and London. 228 pages. $2.00.

It is perhaps not too much to say that Barth is the most discussed person in the theological world today. In Germany his following is unprecedented. It has been said of him that he is the greatest theologian since Schleiermacher. He is still a young man. When he published his commentary on Romans in 1919, he was only thirty-two years old, and this, his first book, fastened on him the attention of the country. Since then, with a number of capable men on his side, there has been a real Barthian school. The young theological generation especially, seems to be fascinated by him.

In our country he is still little known. The critics have said little about him and what was said showed that Barth and his teachings are rather a puzzle to them. It is our conviction that, on the whole, America will derive little profit from him. Americans like an optimist, even now, and Barth is a pessimist. According to Barth man can do nothing, while with us he can even build the kingdom of God. Our country, i. e., the theological world, is shot through with Modernism. Barth has moved away from Modernism and is hailed now as a chief protagonist of the faith of the Reformers. As far as his style is concerned, we refer the reader to what we said on that hand in our review of Dr. Zerbe's book on the "Karl Barth Theology," see page 149, ff, in the March number, 1931. One can read chapter after chapter of Barth's writings and will hardly be able to remember more than a few statements that stick in the memory on account of their unusualness.

That has been our experience even during the perusal of the book before us today. The author is a German theologian, who has studied under Barth, has now been a professor in an American Seminary for five years. He has read nearly everything Barth ever wrote and ought to be able to interpret him to an American audience. He makes an honest attempt to fulfill his task, but if our own experience can be taken as a standard he doesn't bring Barth any closer to our understanding and appreciation than he was before. We believe that Barth is to blame for that.

Professor Pauck portrays the whole development of his hero: his youth in Switzerland, his study, especially in Marburg, where he imbibed German Modernism (the late Professor Herrmann exerted a great influence over him); his pastorates in his native country; the influence of the War on his theological thinking; the publication of his "Roemerbrief" and his successive professorships at Goettingen, Muenster, Bonn.

We discussed Barth's Roemerbrief elsewhere. It was the strangest commentary ever written. The apostle, as Barth explains him, was writing to the church of the 20th century, not to that of the first. The password to the understanding of the whole letter was, according to Barth, the "qualitative difference between time and eternity," although up to this time no one had ever known or said this except Kierke-

gaard. The style and the rank growth of the paradox were enough to drive the not too patient reader to desperation. And yet, the country (the theologs) listened and the commentary awakened an echo a hundred fold.

There has now followed the commentary on 1 Corinthians. It is entitled "The Resurrection of the Dead," as though the whole letter, and not the fifteenth chapter only, dealt with that subject. In it Barth fights against the secularization of the church. It is significant that Barth's commentaries are all on letters of Paul and none on the gospels. He shows a great indifference to the incidents of Christ's life and his teachings. Only his death and resurrection receive a heavy emphasis. With Paul, he doesn't know Christ "according to the flesh." Although he contends so strongly for the revelation character of the Word, although he stresses that it is God who speaks in it; that God revealed himself, first to the men who wrote the Bible, then through the written word, then through the sermon, the spoken word, in spite of all this he treats the actual record of Christ's words and deeds as though it was of no importance. (Bultmann, who belongs to this school, says we don't really know anything for certain of Christ's life—and it seems to him of no consequence.) Barth, by the very success of his writings and activity, was finally compelled to attempt the structure of a theological system. So far only the Prolegomena to a Dogmatics has come out. Schleiermacher, in his system, describes "the Christian faith;" Barth makes the objective "Word of God" his central theme. Pauck struggles manfully with these Prolegomena without succeeding much in enlightening this writer. That—and why—Barth calls his theology one of crisis and why he uses the so-called dialectic method we have explained in the review of Dr. Zerbe's book (as quoted above, March number, page 149 ff). As often pointed out, Barth's chief characteristic is the vigor with which he defends the transcendence of God. While in this country we often hear of the potential godlikeness of man, he puts an impassable gulf between man and God. If that gulf is to be bridged, it can only come from God, never from man. Man can never possess God; he can never experience him. Barth pours contempt on all Pietistic and Methodistic relying on "Erlebnis". All a man can do is offer God the "vacuum" (Hohlraum) of his faith so that God may fill it. But why, when God has filled it, there should not be an experience of the divine, it is hard to see. Pauck seems to find much in Barth's heavy underscoring of God on the "wholly other" that is commendable. On the other hand he thinks that Barth goes too far in his view of the personalism of God. A super-natural personalism, he says, is not a tenable conception for us. "The old belief in the miraculous intervention of an other-worldly, superhuman, anthropomorphic God belongs to the super-natural metaphysics offensive to our minds and consciences." Why must Barth, he asks, renew the structure of the theological thought of the past? "The church in whose name Barth speaks is the church of the past. In consequence he is not in the position to speak the saving word to the present." "The miracles of God's personal appearance in Jesus Christ and of the divine inspira-

tion of the Bible are dead. No dialectics can resurrect them. Only a sacrificium intellectus can."

Pauck tries hard to be fair to Barth. He seems to understand the secret of his influence better than we can, although at times even he is unable to penetrate his obscurities. But the quotations we just cited seem to show that there is an unbridgeable theological abyss between him and the man of the "crisis".

The Christ of the Mount. A Working Philosophy of Life, by *E. Stanley Jones.* The Abingdon Press, New York, 1931. 332 pages, $1.50.

The author of "The Christ of the Indian Road," "Christ at the Round Table," "The Christ of every Road," gives us in this his latest production a very challenging and unusual exposition of the Sermon on the Mount. He thinks what we need in this modern day more than anything else is a working philosophy of life, an adequate way to live. According to him we find this in the Sermon on the Mount; it tells us what the main moral context is in the word "Christian". It can be seen at once that this view will raise decided objections in some quarters. There are those who have called the ethical principles of the Sermon on the Mount an "ad interim" ethics, an ethics that could only be practised by such as believed, with Jesus, in the imminent end of the world. Only then could people be willing to "turn the other cheek," not to resist evil, not to lay up treasures upon earth, etc. But as a guide for the ethical conduct of individuals and society in a world order of indefinite duration, it would be wholly inadequate. Jones, on the other hand, believes that the principles expressed in this sermon, rightly understood, will give the key to the solution of all ethical problems. He does not try to tone its seeming hardness down. No, the very fact that Gandhi and a non-Christian nation took up one truth long forgotten but contained in this sermon, and made it the literal and real basis of a successful struggle for liberty, challenged him to show the practicability of the whole program of Christ.

Its central statement, he says, is the astonishing declaration in chapter five, verse forty-eight, "Be ye, therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." The twenty-seven marks of this perfect life are shown in chapter five. Then, in chapter six and eight up to verse six, we have a diagnosis of the reason why men do not reach or move on to the goal: Divided Personality. In chapter eight, 7-11 the offer of a spiritual dynamic, the gift of the Holy Spirit, is made. Chapter seven, 15-23 contains the test of our moving on: By their fruits. . . . Chapter eight, 24-27 speaks of the survival value of this new life (the house on the rock).

Jones thinks if the Sermon on the Mount had been made the basis of the Christian church instead of the Apostolic creed, it would have been better, something like this: "I believe in the Sermon on the Mount and in its way of life, and I intend, God helping me, to embody it." We understand what he means. Nevertheless, the apostles didn't seem to believe that way. They baptized people on the basis of their faith

in Christ. What Jones suggests is a Christian ethics and it has always been supposed that ethics is the fruit that grows on the tree of faith. Doubtless the tree has often been barren of fruit, the churches have considered orthodoxy of creed more important than orthopraxy of deed—as Jones expresses it. Still, if our ministry is still one of reconciliation, to be reconciled to God in Christ precedes our being reconciled—being brought in right relation with the world. Nevertheless we are agreed with the author when he says, if the ethical side of the gospel is unworkable, the redemptive side is worthless.

The exposition of the beatitudes digs down very deep. Sometimes Jones becomes a little artificial as, e. g., when he divides the nine verses of the beatitudes into three times three, and tries to employ the Hegelian formula of—thesis, antithesis and synthesis, finding the thesis in the first, the antithesis in the second, reaching the synthesis in the third verse. But he is really a "divining rod," as one of his friends called him. He finds water, living water, in the most unexpected places. His ideals are very high, naturally, since perfection is the goal. Can perfection, then, be reached? He says, with John Wesley: yes, perfection of love, not perfection of character, for perfection of love is a gift, perfection of character is a growth, it takes time. Reviewer is not convinced by this reasoning. To him perfection of love seems a growth the same as that of character. If one had perfection of love he could not sin anymore, only make mistakes; for the whole law is contained and fulfilled in the one: love to God and man.

The author is always rich, even profuse, in illustrations. His examples are often very striking. For instance, "The crusaders sang, 'Fairest Lord Jesus, ruler of all nature' and then in his gentle name waded through blood in the streets of Jerusalem and praised him as they dashed out the brains of little children." Or, John Bowring sits on a slave ship and writes the hymn: 'In the cross of Christ I glory,' while beneath him the ship was filled with manacled and wretched slaves. "Once", he says, "he saw an idol car drawn by some men with hooks stuck through the flesh of their backs, through the streets of a city, by ropes attached to these hooks. Religion pulled along at the expense of torn bodies of men. Many of our institutions are being dragged along by the lacerated bodies and minds and souls of men." By the way, Jones gathers out of the Sermon on the Mount not only principles for the life of the individual. The collective sins, war and industrial maladjustment, the materialism and the loose moral standards of the time stand strongly condemned in the light of Christ's teaching and influence. Jones has the true missionary's love for the pagan; he fully appreciates the good elements in various heathen cults. But he is far from being a syncretist. Christ and his teachings are the fulfilment not only of the Old Testament, but also of the aspirations of the heathen world and its religions. Hinduism, he says, has God without morality; Buddhism has morality without God; Christianity is God with morality. Christianity has the renunciation of the world and yet it renders services in and for the world. Its method is that he who saves his life shall lose it and he that loses his life shall save it.

This fundamental law finds in the book a marvelously satisfying treatment.

Mr. Jones's new book we must pronounce a great success. In absorbing interest it is not below his first, although this first contained that striking story of Jones's complete surrender and what it did for his health and work. In his demands on the Christian life he goes very high, but he also brings out very persuasively the sufficiency of the divine dynamic. As an exegete there are few who surpass him in depth, in clearness, in searching thought and in winning charm. Dr. Jones is in a class of his own, a new book of his is an event, and we bear witness that he reaches the inner man as few others can.

The Religious Background of American Culture, by *Thomas Cuming Hall, D.D.* (Professor of English and American History and Culture, University of Goettingen) Boston, Little, Brown and Company, 1930. 348 pages.

It is impossible to understand American life and culture without paying due regard to the influence of religion. In the many books written about America in recent years, according to the author, little attention has been paid to this factor. When, however, in the past the religious heritage of our country was duly considered, the Puritans were said to have been our spiritual ancestors. This interpretation was so general that to take this honor from them would be looked upon as almost a sacrilege. Nevertheless, the author of this book claims that the Puritans had an influence only in New England, and even there not for very long or in a very great measure. According to him American history began before America was discovered. It is the thesis of this book that not the Puritans but *John Wyclif* the author of the *English Dissent*, was the father of the religious tradition which forms the basis of Anglo-American culture.

Wyclif (1324-1384) called one of the fore-runners of the Reformation, differed from Luther as well as from Calvin. There were naturally many things in common between them, as for instance the belief in the Bible as the supreme authority in faith and life. But the Reformers looked to the historic church for the interpretation of the Bible; they accepted the creeds of the first four centuries and they formulated creeds themselves, which were accepted by the church represented by official delegates. Wyclif taught that the Bible could be understood by the layman through the testimony of the Holy Spirit; he laid no creeds on his followers. The Reformers ordained a regular ministry and the ministers administered the sacraments, which were said to be means of grace. Wyclif went further in the matter of the universal priesthood of all believers: he sent out laymen as the preachers of the poor. The sacraments were to him only signs and symbols. He put the pulpit higher than the altar. Calvin's idea of the church in its relation to the state was the theocracy: the state was to carry out the laws and the decrees of the church. Wyclif believed in separation of church and state. Luther leaned on princes, nobles and magistrates; Wyclif addressed himself to the poor of the land.

It can easily be seen that there is a good deal of truth in the author's contention. The stress on the private interpretation of the Bible; the absence of creeds and, therefore, indifference to doctrinal statements and a neglect of theological studies, leading to easy lapses from orthodoxy; a certain looseness in the view of the sacraments; the perfect equality between minister and layman; separation of church and state: all these things are today characteristic of American Protestantism as they were of Wyclif and his adherents, the Lollards ("Babblers"). Naturally this is a judgment subject to many qualifications. The modern Protestant church has been affected by many other influences. From Anglo-Catholics, Lutherans and Catholics she has learned to build beautiful churches, adopt a richer liturgy, satisfy a refined aesthetic taste. And the very consequences of too much private judgment have taught her the desirableness of unity. Still the family traits are quite noticeable yet. To mention one more of them, the stress on the ethical side rather than the doctrinal; on the way of life instead of the belief; is it not the spirit of Wyclif, who emphasized that assurance of salvation could only come from duty well performed; that we must make our election sure by a Christian walk and spirit?

But even if we grant a striking resemblance between Lollardism and Anglo-American Protestantism, how can we explain such a situation if we consider that there were nearly two hundred years between Wyclif and the time of the Reformers? According to the author, the number of adherents of Wyclif was very large. Later, after the Peasants' war, the movement was driven below the surface, but it still persisted. The English Reformation would not have been so comparatively easy if the people had not in some such way been prepared.

The English Reformation under Henry the eighth left as much of the Catholic religion untouched as possible. The claim of the Episcopalians that Henry did not create the Episcopal church is largely justified, says the writer. We cannot say that he proves this statement very convincingly. But it is quite sure that under Henry as well as later under Elizabeth the Church of England never became definitely Protestant. So when today the Anglo-Catholics in this country repudiate the "Protestant" in their official name, they seem to have some right for it, although their thirty-nine articles are certainly Protestant enough.

The Puritan party came into being under Elizabeth. They were of the continental type, especially in Scotland, where they established a state church and made queen and courtiers pay it reverence. The pilgrim fathers who went to America, originally, had in mind to build a city of God in this new country. They soon saw that it could not be done. Their influence on the national and cultural life, the writer never tires to point out, has been much over-rated. It is the party of the independents, the "Congregationalists," who represent the type of religious system that was bound to prevail. They are the true offspring of the English Dissent, having all the earmarks of the Wyclifian heritage we described above.

The writer now goes on to portray the later development: the

period of the War of Rebellion, when rationalism and deism had complete sway; when the Constitution was adopted with its almost complete disregard of religion. Then the general disorganization of the Protestant churches after the war (despite the "Great Awakening" under Jon. Edwards); the reorganization of the Church in the 19th century, on to modern times; the Civil War and after it the growing of religious culture and unity.

A great book, throwing light on many important and controversial points of our religious and national development. We will not say that he is right entirely when he calls Wyclif the father of American Protestantism. But that the main features of the English Dissent are still there and active, we think must be granted. We could not do full justice to the many good things brought out in the book; but that every churchman will find it good and helpful reading, there can be no doubt.

Afterwards, by *Herman J. Schick*. A.M., S.T.D. The Stratford Company, Publishers, Boston, Mass.. 1931. 109 pages, $1.50.

Here Dr. Schick puts into our hands a most unusual little volume. It contains a collection of poems all of which have to do with death and what comes after death. Where does the soul go when released from the body? Is the fate of man irrevocably fixed when he leaves the earthly sphere, or is there development beyond, is there, perhaps, a second chance? Wouldn't it be strange if habits, the result of slow growth here, were to give way to perfection at once, beyond? These and other questions the book seeks to answer. But, of course, the answer can only be a guess; it is not the theologian who speaks, it is the poet who interprets with poetic license.

We do, indeed, here listen to a son of the muses. Schick is a poet. He has the poet's imagination, he has his language of beauty, he has his pathos, his power to thrill the soul. Whatever a man's station in life, death shows him up as a mortal. Whether he is a man of science, a musician, a physician, a sailor, a social butterfly, a teacher, a minister: they all have their rendezvous with death. And with great pictorial power the writer describes the greater possibilities that the hereafter opens up to the man of the good life, as well as the disillusionment coming to the foolish.

It seems hard not to quote from the volume, as, for instance, from the poem, "The Infant":

An infant struggled in anxious arms,
Its body sick and worn.
Its mother wept her bitter tears,
And prayed for her first-born.
'Twas then an angel came
From baby-land of heaven land.
"Come play with me," the angel said,
And waved his shining hand,—
The mother clutched her darling babe,
And looked and screamed,—her child was dead.

. . . . . .

There are few life situations the author does not cover. For all of them the Christian faith has an adequate message. There is no other voice that speaks with such authority or comfort in the presence of death.

This beautiful booklet is a persuasive tribute to the glory of him who says: "I live and ye shall live also!" We wish it an open door to many homes on which the shadows have fallen.

A Preface to Morals, by *Walter Lippmann.* The MacMillan Company, New York, 1929. 348 pages.

Mr. Lippmann, although still a comparatively young man has already won an enviable reputation as the former editor of the New Republic (now of the New York World) and as the author of a number of books. He is a man of wide information and a sympathetic observer of modern tendencies. In the book before us he discusses the decay of the religious spirit in this modern age. He is of the opinion that "the acids of modernity are dissolving the usages and sanctions to which men once conformed." Men don't believe in a God any more who is interested in their affairs; they don't pray, don't go to church; don't believe that the universe is back of the moral order. If we are to keep our lives moral we must find the basis and sustaining power for it somewhere else. We find it in the requirements of our human lives. Man cannot give himself over to his impulses, to a process of unbridled self-expression. Nor can he expect individual and social salvation to come from the mere change of outward condition. His nature has to be "regenerated", this term not to be taken in the former, religious sense, but "denoting the change from selfishness to disinterestedness, from the chaos of warring instincts to the peace of a mature mind. Mr. Lippmann, in other words, adopts the humanistic view point (in the modern meaning of the word).

But unlike Professor Barnes, who rejoices (in his "Twilight of Christianity") at the disappearance of the old faith with its superstitions, Mr. Lippmann has the feeling of a great void when he thinks of the peace of soul that came with the old faith in the father-God and is now gone. He wrote this book, not to unsettle the faith of any one, but to give those comfort and aid who, like him, have a feeling of loss and loneliness in their minds. The modern man, he says, who has ceased to believe without ceasing to be credulous, hangs, as it were, between heaven and earth, and is at rest nowhere. Natural piety he has replaced with a grudging endurance of unsanctified compulsions.

It is impossible for Mr. Lippmann to find consolation in the mediating attempts of the modernists. When men like Fosdick, Inge, Sh. Mathews, Wieman, Kirsopp Lake give us their sophisticated ideas of God, they "use God's name in vain," he says. They don't believe any more that God is the father, the king, the judge. The Bible is to them no authority any more, their own enlightened judgement having supplanted the word of revelation. Christianity, according to them is simply a way of life, but Professor Machen is correct when he reminds them, that it is a way of life *founded upon a message.* Modernism

is "an attempt to preserve selected parts of the Christian experience after the facts which inspired it have been rejected." The Bible is for the modernist a collection of hypotheses. Their God "reigns but he doesn't govern." They do no longer believe in a divinely ordered universe.

Religion has lost many provinces that it formerly controlled. Business doesn't ask the church any more whether it is allowed to charge interest. Birth control makes children a product of the parents' choice, not any longer a gift of the Lord. Art shows the disappearance of religious painting. The "Great Scenario" of the Christian revelation, beginning with paradise, ending with the new earth, and, between, the life of Jesus Christ, has become unreal to those who see in history the play of natural forces.

When the author comes to the place where he is no longer to analyze modern doubt or the passing of old traditions but to construct something that is to take over the up-building of the new society, he is by no means very sure about himself. All he can say in turning to humanism for his resources, is that the principle of order must be an ideal of human personality. Disinterestedness must be its chief concern. To reach this goal, a long career must be traversed. At the end the individual may reach a state of moral maturity. This, in the words of Confucius, frequently quoted by Lippmann, is the stage where "he can do what his heart desires without transgressing the ways of righteousness."

Lippmann in the positive part of the book, largely develops the ideals of the ancient Stoics. No wonder, he says, we are going back to old models. However much we have learned in physics and other sciences, in the study of human nature we haven't advanced over the positions of those of old. So the highest he can tell us to aspire to is a certain detachment from material things, and an active pursuit after the attainment of a mature character. One might reply that such a philosophical way of self-betterment whatever it might do for the individual, or the select few, would be wholly inadequate for the ordinary man, the uneducated masses. Lippmann would grant this to a certain extent. But then, he thinks, science and the natural development of a better social order will in the future make it easier to adjust oneself to the requirements of life. And, on the other hand, the modern man is apt to find it easier to keep his soul unpertrubed: he expects nothing from the universe, so the universe can't disappoint him.

We confess that Lippmann as a critic and diagnostician of the present age and its ills satisfies us more than in the cure he seeks to provide. Still we admire his fine discrimination, the range of his studies, his sympathetic understanding and his whole-hearted honesty. The book deserves a careful perusal, it will put the reader in touch with a very genial personality. We can't help, though, regretting that the author's former religious faith wasn't strong enough to hold out against modern doubt.

Daily Talks With God. A unique calendar that features a scripture passage, devotional reading, prayer and suggested scripture reading for every day in the year.

We recommend these deservedly popular morning devotions, offered again by Eden Publishing House, very warmly. The block consists of 366 sheets, one for every day in the year. The perforation allows removal of sheets without tearing. Scenes of the Holy Land add to the attractiveness of the calendar. It comes in two styles, wall and easel. Prices, either style 60 cents, postage paid; $5.40 per dozen, postage extra.

Die Heiligkeit im Urchristentum. Von **Ragnar Asting.** Verlag von Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, Göttingen 1931. 322 Seiten. Gebd. 22,50 Reichsmark.

Als vor hundertdreißig Jahren Schleiermacher ‚die Religion' und als in unsern Tagen **Otto ‚das Heilige'** aus umstrickenden und niederziehenden Verbindungen herausführte . . ." — so charakterisiert Adolf von Harnack Rudolf Ottos Wiederentdeckung und Wiedergeltendmachung des besondern irrationalen Sinnes der Zentralidee der „Heiligkeit". Wenn nun der norwegische Theologe Asting (Oslo, studierte in Marburg 1924—25) diese Idee der „Heiligkeit" im Urchristentum näher untersucht, so begrüßt man das sehr dankbar und wundert sich höchstens, daß solche Spezialuntersuchung nicht schon viel eher unternommen worden ist. Die einzige vollständige Monographie über dies Thema, die von **Ernst Issel:** „Der Begriff der Heiligkeit im Neuen Testament" (Preisschrift der Haager Gesellschaft zur Verteidigung der christlichen Religion von 1887) ist in Fragestellung und Methode völlig veraltet. **Ragnar Astings** Werk, das nun die Lücke füllt, ist eine sorgfältige religionswissenschaftliche Arbeit. Er untersucht zunächst die Wurzeln des Heiligkeitsbegriffs auf griechisch-hellenistischem Boden wie (vor allem) in der alttestamentlich-jüdischen Religion, und erörtert dann die „Heiligkeit" im Gemeindechristentum vor und neben Paulus, in dem Christentum unter paulinischem Einfluß, unter dem Einfluß der jüdischen Diaspora, unter dem Einfluß des hellenistischen Synkretismus, und in den Johannesschriften. Die Entwicklung der „Heiligkeits-Begriffs im Urchristentum zeigt eine gewisse Parallelität mit der Entwicklung desselben Begriffs innerhalb der israelitisch-jüdischen Religion: zuerst umfaßt die „Heiligkeit" alles und alle, wird aber nach und nach auf einzelnes und einzelne Besondre eingeschränkt. Dem Gehalt nach ist in der Hauptsache der „Heiligkeits"-Begriff durch das ganze Urchristentum hindurch jüdisch bestimmt geblieben, geprägt durch die Momente des Erhabenen und des Ethischen; der Einfluß der hellenistischen Begriffsbedeutung ist geringer, wenn er sich auch nachweisen läßt (Paulus). Lebensvoll und anregend ist Astings exegetische Einzelerörterung alles wesentlichen neutestamentlichen Stoffes, in dem dieser Grundbegriff erscheint (Heiliger Geist, die Christen als die Heiligen, Heiligung usw.). Eine Perle ist z. B. die eingehende Erläuterung der ersten Bitte des Vaterunsers: „Geheiligt werde dein Name." (S. 75—85). Ohne allen Zweifel ist das ausgezeichnete, reichhaltige Buch ein Führer für jeden, der hier nach klarerem und genauerem Verstehen sucht.

Dr. W. Petersmann.

Hermeneutik des Neuen Testaments. Von **Fr. Tom.** Verlag von Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, Göttingen 1930. 253 Seiten. Brosch. 8,50; gebd. 11 Reichsmark.

„Hermeneutik" ist die Wissenschaft vom Auslegen. Die Frage der Exegese und die „ars interpretandi" hat in der christlichen Kirche stets ihre wichtige Rolle gespielt der rechten Auslegung der Bibel wegen, zumal in dem ganz auf der Heiligen Schrift und deren rechtem Verständnis fußenden Protestantismus. Von **Origines** bis zur Reformation folgte man der unglücklichen Theorie des mehrfachen Schriftsinns, von der kirchlichen „Tradition" als Norm des Schriftverständnisses geleitet. Demgegenüber entdeckte und betonte die protestantische Säuberung durch Dr. Martinus **Lutherus** den buchstäblichen Sinn als den einzigen und die vollkommen hinreichende Verständlichkeit („perspicuitas") der Schrift selber: die dunkeln Stellen sind im Lichte der klaren auszulegen und alle einzelnen Stellen vom Schriftganzen aus zu verstehen. Seit 1880 ist nun allerdings innerhalb der protestantischen Literatur keine größere Darstellung der neutestamentlichen Hermeneutik mehr erschienen. **Karl Barth** jedoch brachte durch seinen „Römerbrief" den Stein wieder heftig ins Rollen, sofern er sich entschieden gegen die unbefriedigende bloß historisch-kritische Auslegung der üblichen modernen Kommentare und wieder zurück zu den Reformatoren wandte. Heute ist das Problem der rechten Exegese wieder in lebendigster Diskussion: eben das Problem der **„pneumatischen Exegese,"** der theologisch-dogmatischen Schriftinterpretation und ihrer Beziehung zur historisch-kritischen: K. Girgensohn, J. Behm, E. Seeberg, von Dobschuetz, W. Machholtz, R. Bultmann, H. Frick, Fr. Traub, R. Jelke, E. Fascher u. a. haben sich jüngst (seit 1926 etwa) eingehender dazu geäußert. Da ist es nunmehr sehr verdienstlich, daß der dänische Theologe **Frederik Torm** (Prof. Dr. theol. an der Universität Kopenhagen) uns eine umfassende **Gesamtdarstellung** der Grundsätze und Kunst des Verstehens vorlegt (dänische und deutsche Ausgabe). Eingehend behandelt er die Aufgabe der Hermeneutik, die Schwierigkeiten, die sich aus der Form des Textes ergeben (das neutestamentliche Griechisch, die individuellen Eigentümlichkeiten in Sprache und Stil und die neutestamentliche Bild-Rede), die Schwierigkeiten, die sich aus dem Inhalt des Textes ergeben (Verfasserpersönlichkeit, literarische Form, Apokalyptik, semitischer und hellenistischer Hintergrund, religionsgeschichtliche Vergleiche usw.) und die wichtigsten im Verlauf der Kirchengeschichte aufgestellten Prinzipien der Auslegung (dogmatische, allegorische, analogische). Eine kurze Uebersicht über die Geschichte der Exegese vervollständigt das Bild. Torm hätte freilich über den psychologisch-subjektiven Problemkreis der Verfasserpersönlichkeiten hinaus sich methodisch stärker der objektiven „Sache" selbst zuwenden sollen, der „Dialektik der Sache," um die es in der Botschaft des Neuen Testaments geht. Gesund und solide aber ist sein Drängen auf das grundlegende „buchstäbliche" historische Textverständnis als auch der Blick für die Unterschiede, für das Originale und Neue des Neuen Testaments bei der Ausnutzung des zeitgeschichtlich-religionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrunds. Kurz, wir sind dankbar, wieder einen regelrechten Grundriß der „Hermeneutik" zu haben.

Dr. W. Petersmann.